HISTORY OF ART IN PHŒNICIA

JKM LIBRARY
N5410.P461h Ea v.1
Perrot, Georges,
History of art in Phnicia and its depen
3 9968 02660 8425

AND CYPRUS

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF

McCORMICK
CHICAGO
Virginia Library



HISTORY OF ART IN PHŒNICIA AND ITS DEPENDENCIES.

VOL. I.

HISTORY OF

Art in Phœnicia

AND ITS DEPENDENCIES

FROM THE FRENCH

OF

GEORGES PERROT,

PROFESSOR IN THE FACULTY OF LETTERS, PARIS; MEMBER OF THE INSTITUTE,

AND

CHARLES CHIPIEZ.

ILLUSTRATED WITH SIX HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOUR ENGRAVINGS IN THE TEXT AND TEN STEEL AND COLOURED PLATES.

IN TWO VOLUMES.—VOL. I.

TRANSLATED AND EDITED BY

WALTER ARMSTRONG, B.A., OXON.,

AUTHOR OF "ALFRED STEVENS," ETC.

London: CHAPMAN AND HALL, LIMITED.

1885.

London:
R. Clay, Sons, and Taylor,
bread street hill.

N
5410
P46lhEa

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE PHŒNICIAN CIVILIZATION.

PAGE

§ 1. The Situation of Syria and the Configuration of the Phœnician Coast . . . . . 1—11
§ 2. The Phœnicians; their Origin and their First Establishment . . . 11—56
§ 3. Religion . . . . . 56—83
§ 4. The Phœnician Writing . . . . . 83—93
§ 5. General Remarks upon the Study of Phœnician Art . . . . . 93—102

CHAPTER II.

ON THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF PHŒNICIAN ARCHITECTURE.

§ 1. Materials and Construction . . . . . 103—113
§ 2. Forms . . . . . 113—125
§ 3. Decoration . . . . . 126—141

CHAPTER III.

SEPULCHRAL ARCHITECTURE.

§ 1. The Ideas of the Phœnicians as to a Future Life . . . . . 142—148
§ 2. The Phœnician Tomb . . . . . 149—179
§ 3. Sarcophagi and Sepulchral Furniture . . . . . 179—213
§ 4. The Phœnician Tomb away from Phœnicia . . . . . 213—250

114968

CHAPTER IV.

SACRED ARCHITECTURE.

PAGE
§ 1. The Temple in Phœnicia . . . . . 251—272
§ 2. The Temple in Cyprus . . . . . 272—301
§ 3. The Temples of Gozo and Malta . . . . . 301—318
§ 4. The Temples of Sicily and Carthage . . . . . 318—325
§ 5. On the General Characteristics of the Phœnician Temple . . . . 325—332

CHAPTER V.

CIVIL ARCHITECTURE.

§ 1. Fortified Walls . . . . . 333—364
§ 2. Towns and Hydraulic Works . . . . . 364—384
§ 3. Harbours . . . . . 385—410

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

PLATE.

PAGE

I. Three Cypriot heads . . . . . *To face* 264

TAIL-PIECES, &c.

Cypriot head, Louvre . . . . . *Title.*

Chapter I. Funerary cone, from Sidon 102

„ II. Cone-shaped seal, French National Library 141

„ III. Sardinian scarab 250

„ IV. Coin of Mallos 332

„ V. Sardinian scarab 410

FIG.

1. The Nahr-el-Fedar 5

2. Plan of the passes at the Nahr-el-Kelb 7

3. View of the passes at Nahr-el-Kelb 9

4. Syria in the time of the Egyptian domination 17

5. Tyre before the siege of Alexander 21

6. Tomb at Amrit 24

7. The walls of Arvad 25

8. Phœnician merchant galley 34

9. Phœnician war galley 34

10. Map of the Phœnician colonies in the Mediterranean basin 35

11, 12. Carthaginian coins 52

13. Votive stele from Carthage 53

14, 15. Votive steles from Carthage 54

16. Fragment of a votive stele from Carthage 55

17. Descent from the Pass of Legnia, in the Lebanon 58

18. The sources of the River Adonis 59

19. Coin of Byblos 61

20. Astarte 65

21. Bes 65

22. Pygmy 66

FIG. PAGE
23. Upper part of the stele of Jehawmelek 69
24. Resef 72
25. Baal-Hammon 74
26. From a bronze in M. Péretié's collection 78
27. Child god 79
28. Votive stele 81
29, 30. From a Carthaginian votive stele 80
31. Egyptian writing-case 86
32. Fragment of a bronze cup 90
33. Fragment of a sepulchral cippus 92
34. Phœnician wall of Eryx 97
35. Carthaginian mason's mark 98
36. Phœnician platter 99
37. Rock-cut house at Amrit 104
38. Rock-cut walls at Saïda 104
39. Fragment of the map of Amrit 105
40. The tabernacle of Amrit 105
41. Remains of the walls of Sidon 106
42. Substructure of one of the temples at Baalbek 107
43. Square pier from Gebal 109
44. Wall of Tortosa 110
45. Masonry from the Tower of the Algerines 110
46. Wall of a temple at Malta 111
47. The wall of Byrsa 112
48. Entablature from a temple at Byblos 114
49. Capital at Golgos 117
50. Capital from Eddé 117
51. Cypriot capital 118
52, 53. Cypriot capitals 119
54. Ornament from a Cypriot stele 120
55. Cypriot capital 120
56. Cypriot capital 121
57. The Serpent Grotto 122
58. Coin of Cyprus 123
59. Egyptian coffer 126
60. Phœnician cornice 127
61. Details of a cornice 127
62. Sculptured fragment 128
63. Cornice on a tomb 128
64. Moulding from a plinth 128
65, 66. Mouldings from the base of a pyramidion 128
67. Coin of Byblos 129
68. Elevation of the doorway at *Oum-el-Awamid* and section of the lintel . . 129
69. Winged globe 130
70. Winged globe with crescent 130
71. Sidereal symbols from a Carthaginian stele 131

FIG. PAGE
72. Marble column 131
73. Alabaster slab 132
74. Egyptian winged sphinx 133
75. Phœnician scarabæoid 134
76. Alabaster slab 134
77. Alabaster slab 135
78. Altar with stepped ornament 136
79. Rosettes enlarged 137
80. Stone trough 137
81. Fragment of relief 138
82, 83. Candelabra figured on a stele 138
84. Fragment of a sculptured slab 139
85. Egyptian palette 140
86. Sarcophagus of Esmounazar 143
87. Section of the Burdj-el-Bezzak 150
88. Part of the Cemetery of Amrit 151
89. Tomb at Amrit 152
90, 91. Tomb at Amrit 152
92, 93. Plan and section of a tomb at Amrit 153
94. The Meghazils of Amrit 155
95. Tomb at Amrit 157
96, 97. Plan and section of a tomb at Amrit 158
98. Tomb at Amrit restored 159
99. Longitudinal section of a tomb at Amrit 159
100, 101. The Burdj-el-Bezzak 161
102. Section of a tomb at Sidon 162
103, 104. Wells in a tomb at Sidon 163
105. Longitudinal section of a tomb at Sidon 164
106. Plan of a portion of the necropolis of Sidon 165
107. Section through line A, B, C, of Fig. 106 165
108. Section through D, E 166
109. Section through N, M 166
110. Section through K, L 166
111. Tomb of Esmounazar 167
112. Section of the tomb of Esmounazar restored 168
113. The "Tomb of Hiram" 171
114. Necropolis of Adloun 173
115. Entrance to a Giblite tomb 175
116. Interior of a Giblite tomb 177
117. Section showing the soundings in the Giblite tombs 178
118. Graves dug in the rock at Gebal 180
119. Two Giblite sarcophagi 181
120. Sarcophagus from Oum-el-Awamid 182
121. Cippus from Sidon 182
122. Sandstone coffin 183
123. Leaden coffin 183

FIG. PAGE
124. Sarcophagus of Sidon 184
125. Coffin of painted stone from an old drawing 185
126. Sarcophagus of Sidon 186
127. Head from an anthropoid sarcophagus of Sidon 186
128. Sarcophagus from Sidon 187
129. Sarcophagus from Sidon 188
130. Fragment of an anthropoid sarcophagus in terra-cotta 190
131. Comparative sections of a Phœnician sarcophagus and an Egyptian mummy-case 191
132. Anthropoid sarcophagus from Sidon 192
133. Sarcophagus from Solunte 193
134. Marble sarcophagus found at Solunte 195
135. Sarcophagus from Sidon 198
136. Iron holdfast and coffin handle 198
137. Lion's mask 200
138. Sarcophagus from Sidon 201
139. Alabastron 204
140. Baal-Hammon 205
141. Scarab with face of Bes 206
142. Astarte 208
143. Mother goddess 208
144. Mother goddess 209
145. Terra-cotta chariot 210
146. Silver ring with scarab in agate 212
147. Alabaster vases 216
148. Plan of a tomb at Dali 218
149, 150. Terra-cotta statuettes 219
151. Cypriot stele 223
152. Cypriot stele 225
153, 154. Tomb at Amathus 227
155. Plan of a tomb at Amathus 228
156. Section through the ravine at Amathus 228
157. Interior of a tomb at Amathus 229
158. Doorway of a tomb at Amathus 230
159, 160. Plan of a tomb at Nea-Paphos 231
161. Courtyard of a tomb at Nea-Paphos 232
162, 163. Plan and section of a tomb at Malta 235
164. Cross section of above tomb 236
165. Plan of a Carthaginian tomb 238
166. Section of a Carthaginian tomb 238
167. Plan of a tomb at Sulcis 240
168. Section of a tomb at Sulcis 241
169. Tomb at Cagliari 242
170, 171. Sections of a tomb at Cagliari 243
172. Funerary Cippus from Tharros 243
173, 174. Cippi from tombs at Tharros 244

FIG.		PAGE
175.	Sandstone cippus with Phœnician inscription	244
176.	Interior of a tomb at Tharros	245
177.	Statuette in glazed earthenware	245
178.	Amulet in glazed earthenware	246
179.	Glass amulet	246
180.	Scarab	246
181.	Scarab in form of a sow	247
182.	Amulet in white earthenware, glazed	247
183, 184.	*Etuis* found in the tombs	247
185.	The Maabed at Amrith	253
186.	Ceiling of the Maabed at Amrith	254
187.	The Maabed at Amrith	254
188.	Monolithic tabernacle of Aïn-el-Hayât	257
189.	Plan of the two tabernacles at Aïn-el-Hayât	257
190.	Ruin in the neighbourhood of Sidon	260
191.	Stone altar	261
192.	Votive stele from Carthage	263
193.	Votive stele from Sulcis (Sardinia)	264
194.	Votive stele from Sulcis	264
195.	Statue found near Athieno	265
196.	Limestone statue from Cyprus	267
197.	Artificial grotto near Gebal	269
198.	Capital from Kition, cut from the local stone	274
199.	Coin of Cyprus	276
200.	Plan of the remains of the temple at Paphos	278
201.	Plan of the remains of the temple at Paphos	279
202.	Coin of Cyprus	281
203.	The hill of Paphos, remains of a temple in the foreground	282
204.	Plan of temple at Golgos	282
205, 206.	Elevation of a cone found at Athieno, and section of its lower part	284
207.	Pedestal for two statues	285
208.	Model of a small temple in terra-cotta	287
209.	The Panaghia Phaneromeni. Plan	288
210.	The Panaghia Phaneromeni. Perspective	289
211.	The Amathus vase	290
212.	Small model of a cistern	292
213.	Handle of the Amathus vase	292
214.	Coin of Cyprus	293
215.	Stone step	294
216.	Plan of the crypt at Curium	295
217.	Gold bracelet	299
218.	Coin of Malta	302
219.	Hall in the temple of Hagiar Kim, at Malta	305
220.	Doorway in the temple of Hagiar Kim, at Malta	307
221.	Plan of the Giganteia at Gozo	308
222.	Longitudinal section through the larger temple at the Giganteia	309

FIG. PAGE
223. The cone of the Giganteia 311
224. The Giganteia 311
225. Plan of the temple of Hagiar Kim, Malta 312
226. Interior of the temple of Hagiar Kim 313
227. Decorated stone, from Hagiar Kim 314
228. Altar 315
229. Altar 316
230. Statuette 316
231. Statuette 317
232. Stele from Lilybæum 320
233. Stele from Sulcis 321
234. Lintel at Ebba 322
235. Capital at Djezza 323
236. View of the great mosque at Mecca 327
237. Plan of the rampart near Banias 337
238. The Phœnician wall near Banias 338
239. Plan of the Phœnician wall at Eryx 340
240. One of the towers of Eryx 341
241. Postern in the wall of Eryx 343
242. Postern in the wall of Eryx 344
243. Postern in the wall of Eryx 345
244. The temple and ramparts of Eryx 346
245. The wall of Motya 347
246. Plan of Lixus 349
247. The wall of Lixus 351
248. Map of the peninsula of Carthage 352
249. The triple wall of Thapsus 355
250. The great wall at Thapsus 359
251. Plan of the wall of Byrsa 361
252. Reservoirs of Carthage 369
253. Carthaginian coin 374
254. Rural cistern 375
255. Plan of cistern 377
256. Cross section of cistern wall 378
257. Elevation of part of cistern wall 378
258. Base of column from a portico at Larnaca 380
259. Detail of a portico at Larnaca 381
260. Plan of ancient house at Malta 381
261. View of ancient house at Malta 382
262. The mausoleum at Thugga 383
263. Angle pilaster 384
264. Profile of cornice 384
265. Present condition of the Carthaginian harbours 389
266. The harbours of Carthage according to Beulé 391
267. Arrangement of the berths according to Beulé 391
268. The harbours of Carthage according to Daux 392

FIG. PAGE
269. Cornice moulding 393
270. Utica in the time of Cæsar 397
271. Plan of the naval harbour at Utica 399
272. Admiral's palace, Utica 400
273. Restoration of the northern façade of the Admiral's palace, Utica . . . 403
274. Restoration of a lateral façade 403
275. The mole of Thapsus 408
276. Plan of the mole of Thapsus 409

HISTORY OF ART IN PHŒNICIA AND ITS DEPENDENCIES.

CHAPTER I.

THE PHŒNICIAN CIVILIZATION.

§ 1.—*The Situation of Syria and the Configuration of the Phœnician Coast.*

In this history of art in antiquity, Egypt and Chaldæa occupy a privileged place. The length at which we have dwelt upon their art activities is justified by the fertility and originality of their genius, by the spontaneity of their development, and, above all, by their influence over that later stage in the progress of humanity of which our own civilization is no more than the sequel. Egypt and Chaldæa invented the methods and created the models that awoke the plastic genius of the Greeks. After a long period of probation that genius began, towards the time of Homer, to foster high ambitions, and to attempt works of art in the true sense; but at first it borrowed more than it created; nearly all the motives it employed may be traced to a foreign origin.

We may recognize those motives both by their physiognomy and their arrangement. They were invented far enough from Corinth and Athens, far even from Miletus and Ephesus; they were invented in the valleys of the Nile and the Euphrates; and how did they traverse the vast spaces that had to be crossed before they could arrive upon the Ionian coasts, in Peloponnesus or Attica, in yet more distant Latium and Etruria? How did they contrive

to fix the attention of so many half barbarous races? Was it by their original inventors that they were carried so far a-field? No. Neither Egyptians, nor Chaldæans, nor Assyrians, had occasion to hawk their own goods over the basin of the Mediterranean. Egypt, indeed, equipped fleets and carried on a maritime commerce; she had none of the dread of salt water that used to be attributed to her; but it was upon the Red Sea that she launched her vessels; it was with the tribes of Arabia and of the Somali coasts that she had direct trade relations. There is nothing to suggest that an Egyptian vessel, either of war or commerce, ever put out from the mouths of the Nile and lost sight of the low shores of the Delta on an adventurous voyage to Cyprus or Crete. As for the Chaldæans and the Assyrians, they did now and then succeed in embracing the coasts of Syria in their empire, but it was as conquerors only that they appeared in its maritime cities; they made no attempts to turn them into bases for further conquests; in modern phraseology, their flag never waved over the waters of the Mediterranean.

There must, then, have been middlemen by whom the forms and motives invented in Egypt and Mesopotamia were carried to the foreign races who borrowed and used them; and these middlemen must, by native faculties, by culture and by geographical position, have been naturally fitted for the task they had to fulfil. Among all those nations of the ancient world who have left a name in history, to which especially must we award the honour of having rendered this great service to civilization? We must not, of course, forget the claims of the tribes established in Upper Syria and Asia Minor, the Khetas, the Cappadocians, the Phrygians, and Lydians—the chain of tribes, in fact, that connected the valley of the Euphrates with the shores of the Ægæan Sea. They received with the one hand what they gave with the other. Through them the Greeks of Ionia became possessed of certain myths and forms of worship, of certain processes, types and motives, which we can track across the whole breadth of western Asia. But Egypt could never have won its widespread influence through their means. Land communication remained slow, difficult, and uncertain throughout antiquity. A sandy desert, or a chain of inhospitable mountains inhabited by savages no less inhospitable, was enough to bar all passage to commerce.

With the sea it is another matter. It appears to separate

countries and races, but as a fact it unites them. As soon as man learnt to trust to "the waste of waters" and to so combine the powers of the sail and rudder that his barque became as docile as a horse or camel, he could fix his eyes upon the sun and the stars and take himself whither he pleased. As the fertilising dust is carried by the breeze to fields far enough from that where it is shaken from the parent stem, so ideas travel much faster, much farther, and much more securely when they are carried over sea by the winds than when they have to encounter all the rubs and toils of travel by land. To establish communications between men who are separated by vast spaces there is no go-between so efficient as a maritime population, a population driven year by year, by love of gain and love of adventure, to extend the ever-widening circle of their explorations.

Such a population was at hand exactly when the Egyptians and Mesopotamians required its good offices, their civilizations being ripe for expansion beyond their own borders. Driven by events that we only know by their effects, a people had established themselves on the Syrian coast, not far from the isthmus that unites Africa to Asia, between the valleys of the Nile and the Euphrates and within easy reach of both. In order to reach the frontier of Egypt, at Pelusium, not more than three or four days of a desert in which wells were frequent had to be traversed after quitting the last town in Syria. When they began to risk themselves at sea, the voyage was no less short and easy. Even in the days when sailors crept along the coast, beaching their ships every night, they did not take long to arrive at the eastern mouth of the great African river, whence they might mount at their ease as far into the heart of the country as they wished to go.

To reach Mesopotamia a somewhat longer journey had to be undertaken. But the middle Euphrates throws out a great elbow westwards, which almost brings it into touch with the frontier of Upper Syria, and those making their way eastwards from the coast had only to follow the easy mountain roads which existed both north and south of the Lebanon, and to cross a well-watered plain, before they came to the valley of the great river. They had then only to abandon themselves to its current to arrive in due time in the heart of Chaldæa, on the quays of that Babylon whence numerous canals would put them in communication with every industrial centre in Lower Mesopotamia.

A great future was thus assured to any tribes who should people the region we still call by its ancient name of Syria. That region is bounded on the west by the sea, on the south by the isthmus that separates, or rather joins, Asia and Africa, on the west by the desert of Arabia and the Euphrates, on the north by the southern slopes of Amanus and Taurus. On three sides Syria was bounded respectively by the sea, by chains of mountains and by vast stretches of barren sand, so that the industrious communities who occupied it could only be attacked from a few points; from the south, where there was no natural barrier, by the wide passes of the north-east, and by those narrow defiles in the north-west called the Cilician gates. In the interior of the country, strong fortresses capable of offering a long and stubborn resistance to the invader could be erected on several sites which complacent nature had provided, and as a last resource the tribes could take to their ships and retreat either to the small islets that stud the coast, or to the large islands in the west, one of which, Cyprus, could be descried on a clear day from the heights on the Syrian shore. The teeming waters which bathed the long line of coast must soon have excited in those who dwelt there the wish to risk themselves upon the sea and to hoist their sails to the breeze.

A large part of the country could only be inhabited by a sea-faring population—I mean the part squeezed in between the sea and the slopes of the Lebanon. Elsewhere one encounters spacious plains like the fertile *Bekaa*, or Cœlo-Syria, like the wondrous garden that hides Damascus in its waving verdure, like the plains of Esdraelon and the country of the Philistines. But from Mount Carmel to the Cape of Tripoli the summits rise to a height of some 3,000 feet, so close to the sea shore that no room is left for agriculture, and the two great rivers that are nourished by the springs and snows of the Lebanon, the Orontes and the Jordan, flow north and south; the rivers that flow to the coast are no more than mountain torrents. The most important of them all, that which falls into the sea between Tyre and Sidon, the *Nahr-el-Litani*, was called by the Greeks the *Leontes*, or "river of the lion." The *Nahr-el-Kelb*, or "river of the dog," joins the sea north of the roads of Beyrout. Both of these are brawling torrents and thoroughly deserve their names (see Fig. 1).

Between the sea and the great buttresses of the Lebanon there is seldom room for more than a narrow beach, a long ribbon of

sand divided every now and then by high and rocky capes. In the centuries that elapsed before man learnt to modify the configuration of the ground, and to make roads even along cliff-faces, it was difficult in the last degree, it was at times even impossible, to follow the trend of the coast, at least by land. In the autumn



FIG. 1.—The Nahr-el-Fedar.

rains, moreover, and when the snows melt in the spring, the mountain torrents are unfordable near their mouths, while no boats can live in them. But as civilization advanced men learnt to cut paths, or rather ladders, in the faces of the rocky spurs that had so long barred their way. These paths still exist. On my way from Sour to Saint Jean d'Acre, by the *Ras-el-Abiad* and the *Ras*

en-Nakourah, I made use of them, and never, even in the East, have I journeyed by a worse route, or by one on which the traveller is more at the mercy of his beast, whose sureness of foot is tried at every step.

The Romans were the first to make communication easier and more certain. At the entrance to the gorge of the *Nahr-el-Kelb*, near Beyrout, the road they cut through the rock in order to avoid the abrupt ascents of the old pass, is still in use. The levels of this Roman road are much easier; it doubles the cape instead of scaling its heights. It was by the old path that Assyrian and Egyptian armies found their way along the coast (see Figs. 2 and 3).[1]

It was long enough, however, before the Romans appeared that the tribes whose doings we have now to study settled in the country. If they wished to penetrate into the mountains they had to wait till summer, and then make their way along the beds of the dried-up torrents; if they wanted to turn them and follow the coast, they could do so in many places by a narrow strip of sand, but elsewhere the waves beat against the actual knees of the hills.

At these latter points there was no road at all, or at most a giddy path along the face of the cliff, better fitted for goats than men. A pedestrian accustomed to its difficulties could make use of it with safety, but no one would dream of riding over or even of attempting to lead a string of pack horses along such a track.

While the solid earth presented difficulties that must long have seemed insurmountable, the sea was open to all. It was upon the sea that the little plains on the coast had their outlook. In these the same configuration was repeated again and again. Here and there the mountains retire a certain distance from the sea and leave room for a few leagues of flat ground where houses could rise among fields and vineyards, or for slopes on which the vine and olive could flourish. These were sites prepared by nature for future cities, but before the latter could come into existence, easy circulation had to be provided for men and goods between one canton and another. Nothing could be more simple; the sea was at hand ready to carry anything that would float. As soon as the elements of navigation were mastered, no farther embarrassment in

[1] We borrow this plan and view from an interesting article contributed by Mr. W. S. BOSCAWEN to the *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology* (*The Monuments and Inscriptions on the Rocks at Nahr-el-Kelb*, vol. vii. pp. 331-352).

the matter of locomotion between one township and another could

FIG. 2.—Plan of the passes at the Nahr-el-Kelb.
Egyptian bas-reliefs, i. vi. viii. ; Assyrian bas-reliefs, ii. iii. iv. v. vii. ix.

be felt. Except for a few stormy weeks in the year ships could come and go, driven by the winds when they were favourable, by

the sturdy arms of rowers when the breeze was contrary or absent altogether; at nightfall or at any sudden menace from the sky, they could seek the nearest haven. And havens were plentiful. The mountain spurs which hindered land travelling were the salvation of the mariner. On one side or the other of each jutting cape he found shelter from wind and wave. Here he would ride at anchor and wait for better weather, or if the worst came to the worst, he could beach his ship in some narrow creek and make all snug until the tempest should have spent its force.

Many things must then have combined to lengthen a voyage; but time was of no great value—a few hours or a few days more or less made no great difference. The important thing was to be able to come and go; to sally at will from home and to return at pleasure. In those days the mountains were clothed to their feet in forests which furnished splendid timber for ship-building, and that in inexhaustible quantities, so that it was easy to establish workshops on the shore in which the sound of the hammers should never cease. The carpenter who built and the mariner who sailed the ships furnished between them a bond of union for all the inhabitants of the coast, and prevented the isolation to which the peculiar formation of the country would otherwise have condemned each separate group.

Even now it is mainly by the sea that the towns on the Syrian coast communicate with each other. The only difference is that the feluccas are now aided in the work by the steamboats that ply between the larger ports. In other ways the ancient customs have been preserved. No one wishing to go from Latakieh to Tripoli, from Tripoli to Beyrout, or from Beyrout to Jaffa, would go by land, except, of course, tourists and archæologists.

In our days the profits of the traffic go chiefly to England and Austria, to France and Greece; but it was not always so. For many centuries it was to Syrian ports that the vessels belonged by which the three basins into which the Mediterranean is divided were ploughed in every direction. The beginnings were modest enough. In their quest of elbow room, the tribes crept up and down the coast, doubling, not without trepidation, the beetling promontories with their fringe of foam. Gradually they explored the whole coast, from Carmel to Casius; they became familiar with the set of the currents, with every secure anchorage and every sheltering bay; they learnt to read the signs of coming

FIG. 3.—View of the passes at the Nahr-el-Kelb.

storms. To turn their ships' prows out into the open and to become a people of merchants and adventurous mariners were then only matters of time.

§ 2.—*The Phœnicians; their Origin and their First Establishment.*

According to all probability, it was towards the twentieth century before our era—rather before that than after—that the Phœnicians appeared in Syria; and by the Phœnicians we mean, with the Greeks, the peoples who settled on the coast at the foot of Lebanon; other tribes, their more or less distant relations, dwelt north, east, and south of them.[1]

How did they come there, and whence? According to a tradition gathered by Herodotus from one of their descendants, their ancestors lived on the shores of the Persian Gulf,[2] where they peopled the Bahrein Islands, two of which were still called Tyros and Arados in the time of Strabo. They passed for the mother countries of the two great towns on the Syrian coast, and we are told that they contained temples similar in appearance to those of Phœnicia.[3] Perhaps some of the resemblances between the Phœnicia of the Mediterranean and that of the Indian Ocean were after-thoughts on the part of the latter, which may have thus thought to attract curious visitors to its coasts; but the story must have been founded on fact. The Hebrew Scriptures agree with the Greek historians in speaking of the great migrations that carried into Syria, towards the period of the first Theban empire, those

[1] There are no grounds for insisting upon the Greek etymologies of the word; which they sometimes derived from the name of the palm-tree, sometimes from that of the colour red, which was dear to a people who long had a monopoly in the manufacture of purple dye. It is now generally agreed that the word is a corruption of the name given by the Egyptians to the whole bulk of the populations of Arabia and the Persian Gulf; the *country of Punt*. The primitive form would seem to be better preserved in the names *Pœni*, *Punici*, given by the Romans to those Phœnicians of Africa with whom they were so long embroiled (see MASPERO, *Histoire ancienne*, p. 169, and PH. BERGER, *La Phénicie* [article reprinted from *L'Encyclopédie des Sciences religieuses*], p. 3).

[2] HERODOTUS, ii. 89.

[3] STRABO, xvi. iii. 4. PLINY, *Nat. Hist.* vi. 32. According to Pliny the real name of Strabo's Tyros was Tylos.

so called Canaanitish populations of which the Phœnicians formed the eastern branch. Must we suppose that, to reach their new home, they traversed the deserts of Arabia by a line of oases, or that they mounted the stream of the Euphrates and descended from its upper stretches upon the lands to the west and south-west? We cannot tell; all that we know is that those districts were conquered from the savage tribes which had occupied them, that the new-comers took possession of all the sites they fancied from where Aleppo and Damascus now stand, in the north, to the river of Egypt and the peninsula of Sinai in the south, and that while one section threw themselves upon Egypt and founded the power of the shepherd kings, the rest, the Phœnicians of history, settled upon the Syrian coast between Mounts Carmel and Casius, and there, in situations covered on the east by a thick curtain of hills, founded many cities for which a brilliant future was in store.

To what family of peoples did the Phœnicians belong?

Relying upon the genealogical table in the tenth chapter of Genesis, some have supposed them to belong to the stem of Cush; so that they would be cousins of the Egyptians, like the Canaanites, who, according to the same genealogy, were also sons of Ham.[1] But on the other hand since the Phœnician inscriptions have been deciphered it has been recognized that the Phœnician and Hebrew languages resembled each other very narrowly—so narrowly that they might almost be called two dialects of one tongue. If this be so, ought we not rather to connect the Phœnicians with that great Semitic race of which the Hebrews are the most illustrious representatives? We cannot say how close the relationship may have been, but in any case the Phœnicians must have been much more nearly connected with the Hebrews than with the Egyptians and the other nations whom we know as Cushites and Hamites. The difference of religion on which so much insistance is placed by those who would derive the Phœnicians and Hebrews from separate stocks, must have resulted from differences in the material conditions and destinies of the two nations. Habits, and, after a time, religious

[1] LEPSIUS, *Die Völker und Sprachen Africas. Einleitung Zur nubischen Grammatik*, Weimar, 1880, pp. XC.-CXII. MASPERO, *Histoire ancienne*, pp. 147-8. PH BERGER, *La Phénicie*, p. 2.

beliefs, no doubt varied greatly between Jerusalem and Tyre and Sidon; but arguments drawn from such evidence can hardly stand against the identity of language. If we accept the Cushite descent, we can only explain this identity in one way, namely, by supposing that the Hebrews exercised sufficient influence over the Phœnicians to induce them to abandon their own idiom for that of the descendants of Abraham. But there are many serious difficulties in the way of such an explanation, which is, moreover, in conflict with all that we know of Phœnician history.

It was only under David and Solomon that the Hebrews won great political and military prestige in Syria, and at that time Phœnicia had been a solidly-established state for many centuries. We have no reason to doubt that she had also been long in full possession of her language and written character. Moreover it is not difficult to gather from the historical and prophetic books of our Bible that, during the whole of the period of the kings of Israel and Judah, both before and after the schism of the ten tribes, the Phœnicians acted upon the Jews rather than the Jews upon the Phœnicians. We do not find that from the coming of David to the Captivity, the Jews made any attempt to conquer Phœnicia or to bring her under their sovereignty in any way; they do not seem to have impressed upon her either their manners or their ideas; on the contrary, it was from Tyre that they drew the architects and master workmen who built the temple of Jehovah. In defiance of their own prophets they never ceased to borrow from the same people both the images and names of their gods and the rites in which they were worshipped. A Syrian princess, Athaliah, reigned at Jerusalem, but there is nothing to suggest that a Jew ever rose so high in the towns on the coast. If not under their kings, when could the Jews have wielded any such influence or authority over their rich and industrious neighbours as to cause them to throw aside the non-Semitic idiom they had brought from their distant fatherland and adopt Hebrew instead?

Search the history of Palestine from beginning to end and you will find no stage at which such a substitution was possible; and on the other hand if you refuse to admit that the Phœnicians were of the same blood as the Jews, how do you account for their speaking and writing, not one of the idioms which we encounter at their

best in Africa, but a language that differs little from pure Hebrew?[1]

We could not put aside this question of origin altogether, and it was better that we should explain those solutions of the problem that seemed to us best founded.[2] But whether we call them Semites or Cushites the Phœnicians are the only nation of the Canaanites which can pretend to occupy a conspicuous and well-understood place in the history of art. Nearly all the tribes of the interior remained in their original condition of agriculturists and nomad shepherds. The only tribe that succeeded in founding a powerful state was that of the Khetas or Hittites, which settled in northern Syria. We shall have occasion to return to these Hittites who, thanks to recent discoveries, have now emerged from the obscurity in which they were so long buried. We shall endeavour to show that they too had an influence upon the civilization of their western neighbours which must be taken into

[1] The opinion we have here expressed is that now held by the scholar who has most closely studied the question. M. ERNEST RENAN began by studying the Phœnician remains on the spot; afterwards, in his lectures at the *Collège de France*, he explained all the texts now extant, and prepared translations of them for the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*. He will be our chief guide in these pages. We shall continually have to quote his great work, the *Mission de Phénicie* (1 vol. 4to., and a folio of 70 plates, Paris, Michel Lévy, 1863-74). We also owe much to the ready liberality with which our learned colleague has put his knowledge at our service whenever we have had to consult him in the course of our work. We may also take this opportunity to express our obligations to M. PH. BERGER, associated for many years with M. Renan, in the researches undertaken for the *Académie des Inscriptions*. M. Berger has given us much useful information. From the many papers he has published on Phœnicia and Carthage we have borrowed even more frequently than our foot-notes indicate.

[2] In many respects this question is still very obscure. The place given to the Canaanites in the genealogies of Genesis has been explained by the natural antipathy they inspired in a people with whom they disputed the possession of Palestine, and who expressed their hatred by making them the descendants of Ham, that is of an ill-conditioned and accursed ancestor; "but," objects M. Berger, "from that point of view the Hebrews would have done the same to the Moabites, the Ammonites, and, especially, to the Idumaeans and Amalekites, their traditional enemies" (*La Phénicie*, p. 2). But as a fact they consented to recognize those detested tribes as their kinsmen. We do not under-estimate the force of the objection, although we cannot allow it to stand before the great fact of the identity of language. In his *Origines de l'Histoire*, M. Fr. Lenormant has not yet discussed the question. He has begun an examination of the ethnographical tables in the tenth chapter of Genesis, but in his second volume he has only got as far as the family of Japhet. (M. Fr. Lenormant has died since these words were in print, and his *Origines de l'Histoire* remains a fragment.—ED.)

account. But even when science has discovered the key to those inscriptions which are still mute, the Hittites will never loom so large as the Phœnicians in the great picture of the progress of human civilization.

Phœnicia takes up but a narrow space on the map; it was about 130 miles from north to south, by a few miles wide at the broadest part; but its ships carried the products of its own workshops, as well as of those of Egypt and Chaldæa, to the utmost limits of the ancient world; by its models and the knowledge of its processes it acted on the intelligence of every country to which its merchants made their way. Scholars are not all agreed as to the force of that influence and the extent of its effects, but none of them dispute the great importance of the Phœnicians as manufacturers and as agents of distribution. Nothing that concerns such a people is without interest, and in order properly to understand the part they played in the work of civilization we must begin by making ourselves acquainted with the mode in which their cities sprang up and developed, with their political institutions and their religious beliefs.

The first Egyptian documents to mention the Phœnicians date from the eighteenth dynasty, or from a period sixteen to seventeen centuries before our era.[1] If we allow two or three centuries, which is none too much, for these tribes to explore the country, to choose sites for their towns and to build their walls, we find ourselves carried back to the nineteenth or twentieth century for their first appearance in Syria—which is very near the date to which we believe the invasion of the Canaanites should be

[1] The report of an Egyptian officer who visited the basin of the Dead Sea in the time of the twelfth Theban dynasty is still extant. No Canaanitish tribe is mentioned in it (FR. LENORMANT, *Manuel de l'Histoire ancienne*, vol. iii. p. 9). On the other hand, in the account of an imaginary journey made by an Egyptian functionary into Syria towards the end of the reign of Rameses II., an account contained in a precious papyrus of the British Museum, the hero, who penetrated as far as Helbon, the Aleppo of to-day, comes back by the Phœnician coast; he mentions Gebal, Beryta, Sidon, Sarepta, Avatha, whose ruins now bear the name of Adloun, and he finally arrives at "the maritime Tyre," which he describes as a townlet perched on a rock amid the waves. "Water is taken to it in boats," he says, "and the sea is full of fishes" (FR. LENORMANT, *ibid*, p. 34). Mr. Lieblein thinks he has found traces of the Phœnicians in Egypt as early as the sixth dynasty (*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, 1882; p. 108); but the presumptions he invokes in favour of his hypothesis do not seem to give it any high degree of probability.

assigned. But no chronology that can be called certain or even very probable can be given for the early years of Phœnicia, any more than for those of Egypt or Chaldæa.[1]

All that we can affirm with certainty is that when the great Theban Pharaohs began their Syrian wars, the Phœnicians were already in possession of the Syrian coast and had founded most of those cities whose names are encountered in their history (see Fig. 4).[2] Taking them in their order from north to south these were Aradus or Arvad (*Ruad*), Marath (*Amrit*), Simyra, Arka, Gebal, the Byblos of the Greeks (*Gebeyl*), Berytos (*Beyrout*), Sidon (*Saïda*), Sarepta (*Sarfend*), Tyre (*Sour*), Accho (*Acre* or *St. Jean d'Acre*), and Joppa (*Jaffa*). All these sites were so well chosen that hardly one of them is now deserted. Even when the country was most completely disorganized by wars of race and religion, by fanaticism and by bad government, nearly all these cities kept their inhabitants. Except at Beyrout their population is, of course, very far from being what it was in antiquity, but it has never fallen so low that Tyre and Sidon, Acre and Joppa have ceased to be markets of some importance and the chief towns of their districts. Still more significant is it that during the twenty centuries which have seen that stretch of coast pass under so many masters, not a single new centre of urban life and commerce, not a town that can be called modern, has been established. The ancient cities of the Canaanites are still all the country possesses and they are known to the modern world by names in which two thousand years have worked but little change.

The national tradition, preserved in cosmogonic form by Sanchoniathon, made Berytos and Gebal the two oldest establishments on the coast.[3] Gebal, indeed, boasted of being the

[1] According to HERODOTUS, the Syrians, when they received the visit of the historian, told him that their town had been inhabited and their temple of Hercules built for 2,300 years, which would place the founding of the city about the middle of the twenty eighth century B.C. From this statement, however, we may be permitted to take off something for local vanity. Tyre had become the most important city in Phœnicia, and it would endeavour to exaggerate its age in order to make people forget, if possible, that Sidon had reason to boast of a greater antiquity and of a more venerable premiership.

[2] This map and the next (fig. 10) are borrowed from M. MASPERO'S *Histoire ancienne*. We have introduced some slight changes into them which our readers will readily understand when they remember the different aims of our work and M. Maspero's history.

[3] Upon Sanchoniathon and his translator, Philo of Byblos, as well as upon the

FIG. 4.—Syria in the time of the Egyptian domination.

oldest city in the world ; it had been built, according to the story, by the god El, at the beginning of time. At first the natives of Gebal seem to have exercised a real authority over the rest of the Phœnicians,[1] but owing to events which now escape us a city farther to the south, Sidon, soon rose to the first rank ; in Genesis Sidon is already spoken of as the first-born of Canaan.[2] In the beginning it was no more than a village of fishermen, as its name *Tsidôn*, "a fishery," proves. "It was at first confined to the southern slope of a small promontory jutting out obliquely towards the south-west. The famous harbour is formed by a low chain of rocks running parallel to the shore for some hundreds of yards and touching the northern extremity of the peninsula. The neighbouring plain is well provided with water and covered with those gardens which have given to the town the *sobriquet* of the flowery Sidon." [3]

Sidon soon had two rivals, Arvad on the north and Tyre on the south. Arvad was built on an island at some distance from the main land. "It is," says Strabo, "a rock beaten on all sides by the sea, and about seven stades in circumference. It is entirely covered with dwellings, and the population is still so thick that the houses are all many stories high. The inhabitants are provided with drinking water partly by cisterns, partly by a supply brought from the opposite coast." [4] In the centre of the channel between the island and main land there was a strong spring bubbling up through the sea water. In times of siege, when the cisterns had been emptied, the inhabitants turned to this spring and obtained supplies of water from it by the help of skilful divers.[5] The people of Arvad made themselves masters of the strip of coast that faced their island ; Gabala, Paltos, Karne, Marath and Simyra were dependent upon them, and it would seem that for a time

value of those fragments which have come down to our time, see M. RENAN'S *Mémoire sur l'Origine et le Caractère véritable de l'Histoire phénicienne qui porte le Nom de Sanchoniathon* (*Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, new series, 1868, vol. xxiii. part ii.). Sanchoniathon (*Sanchôn Iathon* = "the god Sanchon has given") must have written in Phœnician, in the time of the Seleucidæ, about the second or third century before our era. He must therefore have been a contemporary, or little removed from it, of Manetho and Berosus—about the time of Hadrian. Philo must have made a free translation of the work of Sanchoniathon into Greek.

[1] MOVERS, *Die Phönizer*, vol. ii. part i. pp. 1-4.
[2] Genesis x. 15.
[3] MASPERO, *Histoire ancienne*, p. 190.
[4] STRABO, xvi. ii. 13.
[5] Strabo gives a description of the way in which this feat was performed.

their supremacy extended to Hamath, on the other side of the mountains, in the valley of the Orontes.

While the Arvadites thus enjoyed an uncontested supremacy in the north, the Syrians dominated, in the same fashion, the whole of southern Phœnicia, between the mouth of the Leontes and the country of the Philistines. For many centuries the other towns of that region were hardly more than provincial branches, so to speak, of Tyre. *Tsor* means a rock, and the modern name *Sour* is therefore more like the ancient name than the Greek Τύρος, or Tyre, which has been put into general use by the classic writers. Like those of Arvad, the founders of Tyre chose an island for the site of their town. When they established themselves upon it it must have been separated from the main land by about three-quarters of a mile of water, which was quite enough for defence; it put Tyre out of reach of any enemy but one who should be master of the sea. To compare small things with great, Tyre had a geographical situation analogous to that in which so much of the strength of England lies. She could defy oriental conquerors like the kings of Nineveh and Babylon, and it was not until Alexander joined the island to the main land by an artificial isthmus that she fell. The creation of this causeway had other effects than the destruction of Tyre's impregnability. It arrested the passage of the sand which the currents swept along the coast, so that the harbours of the Phœnician city silted rapidly up, and in these days there is but one left, that which used to be called *the Sidon harbour*, which can receive a few small vessels. As for the other, *the Egyptian harbour*, it is so completely obliterated that modern explorers grope for its site, and even those who have most carefully examined the peninsula are not in accord as to where it was situated.[1] A sketch that we borrow from M. Renan shows what he thinks as to the position of the two harbours[2] (Fig. 5).

The rocky island, or rather the group of rocky islands which were afterwards united and enlarged artificially to form the soil of

[1] Upon this difficult question of topography see RENAN'S *Mission de Phénicie*, iv. ch. i. M. Renan recites and discusses the opinions of his predecessors, MM. de Berton, Poulain de Bossay, Movers, and others who have tried to throw light upon the same problem.

[2] The shaded spaces show the ground filled in by Hiram, the lines of asterisks the actual trend of the shore.

Phœnician Tyre, gave but a narrow site for a town. On the south side the sea seems to have now taken back to itself a strip of ground that had been reclaimed in ancient times by embankments and retaining walls. As at Arvad, the houses were very high and packed very close.[1] Allowing for all possible economy of space it is difficult to see how the island of Tyre can ever have held more than about twenty-five thousand souls.[2] This seems astonishing, but we must remember, in the first place, that the insular town had a corresponding city on the main land which bore the same name, and was no doubt at least as populous as the maritime Tyre; and secondly, that the highly cultivated plain in the

FIG. 5.—Tyre before the siege of Alexander. From Renan.

neighbourhood of the former supported and employed a large population of peasants and slaves.[3] In times of peace, therefore, the Tyrian population was doubled, or perhaps trebled, by this continental faubourg and its smiling environs. And again we must not forget that maritime and commercial cities on islands often have an importance out of all proportion to their extent. M. Renan cites the example of St. Malo, which resembles Tyre

[1] STRABO, xvi. ii. 23. "It is said that the houses there are very high and have more stories than in Rome."

[2] The surface of this island has been estimated at 576,508 square metres.

[3] *Mission de Phénicie*, iv. ch. ii.

very much in situation, and at one time was a maritime centre almost of the first order, while it managed to give house room to more than 12,000 people on a surface less than that of the Syrian island by more than two-thirds.[1]

As we reflect upon all the advantages offered by the site of Tyre, at once close to the main land and separated effectively from it, we are tempted to believe that it must have been one of the first points occupied by the Phœnicians, who had already, in the Persian Gulf, learnt the safety that attends life on an island. Tyre was perhaps as old, then, as Sidon, but Sidon was the first to rise into prosperity. Neither in the tenth chapter of Genesis nor in Homer do we hear a word of Tyre.[2]

We have now glanced rapidly down the Phœnician coast from Arvad to Joppa; we have called the attention of our readers to its principal cities, to those which have left the most conspicuous traces in history, and in doing so we have, we hope, given them some idea as to what Phœnicia really was. It was not a compact nation occupying a large and continuous territory. It had no resemblance to such countries as Egypt, Chaldæa and Assyria. To describe it accurately, it was no more than a series of ports each of which was set in a more or less narrow frame of cultivated land. These towns, situated one or two days' march from each other, were the centres of a life wholly municipal, like that of a Greek city. When their independence was menaced by the formidable monarchies of Egypt or Assyria, of Babylon, Persia or Macedonia, even the pressure of a common danger could not make them unite for common defence. The only bonds between the different townships were those due to identity of origin, language, and written character, and those arising from community of interests in business, from similarity of social habits and religious beliefs.

It would seem that there were three distinct Phœnician communities until the Macedonian conquest, and especially the

[1] *Mission de Phénicie*, p. 553. Perhaps a more apt comparison, at least to English readers, would be one with Venice, which, thanks to a situation similar in all essentials to that of Tyre, was in the middle ages enabled to hold a position in the world differing very little from that enjoyed by the Syrian city fifteen hundred years before.—ED.

[2] STRABO notices this in the case of Homer, XV. ii. 22.

diffusion of Greek culture, came to efface all differences. First there was that of Arvad, which is hardly mentioned by the Greek and Roman historians at all; it was, however, very ancient, for the Arvadites figure among the sons of Canaan in the genealogies of Genesis,[1] but we know hardly anything of its history. The oblivion in which it has rested is explained by the situation of this group of towns. It was masked, so to speak, by the Lebanon, which cut it off from lower Syria and the valley of the Orontes. It was thus a little aside from the path of those Egyptian and Assyrian conquerors whose disputes for the possession of the country were so often renewed. Moreover it appears that the Arvadites leaving to others the risks and profits that attended voyages to very distant countries, were contented with a coasting trade to Cyprus and Rhodes, and along the southern shores of Asia Minor. Thanks to this prudent commerce the whole district of Arvad became very prosperous. To the south of the island the coast described a wide gulf or bay, not unlike that of Genoa, and bordered with many rich villages and small towns, of which Marath was the chief.[2] The rich shipowners of Arvad had their country houses, their farms, and their tombs upon the main land (see Fig. 6). According to Strabo their island was no more than seven stades, or about 1,416 yards, in circumference; it was therefore small enough for the crowded masses of human beings who found shelter behind its formidable walls (Fig. 7); there was no room in it for the dead.

Gebal, or Byblos was the centre of another Phœnician community which preserved its own individuality until the last days of antiquity. There religious sentiment seems to have been more intense and to have played a more important part than anywhere else in Phœnicia. "Byblos," says M. Renan, "appears more and more to me to have been a sort of Jerusalem of the Lebanon."[3] Both in language and in bent of mind the Giblites seem to have been more like the Hebrews than the rest of the Phœnicians. In the great Byblos inscription, which is one of the most precious monuments of Semitic epigraphy, the King Jehawmelek (about 500 B.C.) addresses his great goddess, the lady Baalat-Gebaïl, in terms which might well, with some exceptions, have issued from the lips

[1] Genesis x. 15-18.

[2] RENAN, *Mission de Phénicie*, p. 21.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 215.

of a pious Jew. He speaks of himself, in the Bible words, as "a



FIG. 6.—Tomb at Amrit. From Renan.

just king, and fearing God."[1] In later times it was at Byblos and

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, vol. i. part i. no. 1, and plate 1. M. PH. BERGER has given a translation of the Jehawmelek inscription into French; it will be found in the lecture he gave at the Sorbonne under the title "Les Inscriptions Semitiques et l'Histoire" (*Bulletin de l'Association*, 27th February, 1883, p. 13).

in its dependent valleys, that the mysteries of Astarte and Adonis were celebrated, as well as the licentious rites of Tammouz, which were so popular in Syria throughout the Græco-Roman period.

Finally we come to the Phœnician community *par excellence*, that of Tyre and Sidon, the southernmost of all. We there find the peculiar genius of the race at its greatest development, its taste for trade and industry, its love of maritime adventure, its readiness to accommodate itself to new conditions, its marvellous skill in opening relations with the most savage tribes and in implanting new wants in their breasts. In all that we shall have to say of the



FIG. 7.—The walls of Arvad. From Renan.

rapid expansion of Phœnicia and of the influence it exercised over the peoples of the west, we must be understood to speak of these two great cities, and especially of Tyre. The other Phœnician cities may have supplied sailors for the Tyrian ships and cargoes for their holds,[1] but it was Sidon first, and then, with increased decision and enterprise, it was Tyre, that took the initiative and

[1] Addressing Tyre, EZEKIEL says (xxvii. 8): "*The inhabitants* of Zidon and Arvad were thy mariners: thy wise men, O Tyrus, that were in thee, were thy pilots," which confirms what we say as to the division of the work. Tyre recruited her marine along the whole coast, but she herself furnished it with officers.

general direction of the movement. The captains of those two great cities were the earliest to press on towards the setting sun, till first the pillars of Hercules and afterwards still more distant points were left astern of their ships.

We know very little of the institutions of the Phœnician cities; we know practically nothing of their political and social life. So far as we can guess they had a political system analogous to those of several cities of modern Europe in which similar ambitions and habits of life found a place, such as Genoa, Venice and the Hanse towns. Wherever the exigencies of a great maritime commerce tend to concentrate capital in a few hands, and to enable the more capable citizens to accumulate huge fortunes, there we always find a powerful aristocracy. This aristocracy sometimes leaves an appearance of power to popular assemblies or hereditary princes, but by right of its great wealth and superior intelligence it always keeps the reality of power in its own hands.

Between such cities as those we have named, the chief difference lies in the varying exclusiveness of the aristocracy by which they are governed. In some it closes its ranks to new-comers and tends to oligarchy; in others it opens them and welcomes a certain measure of democracy.

It is difficult to say to which side Sidon and Tyre inclined. We are better informed, or rather we are a little less ill informed, as to the great African colony of Tyre, Carthage, and perhaps we may venture to assume that the daughter inherited a good deal of the mother's constitution. In the light of such an analogy we should say that the system of the Phœnician cities tended strongly to oligarchy. The inscriptions and the Greek historians, tell us, however, that they had kings. At Arvad we find a dynasty in which the names of Aniel and Jerostratus alternate with each other. At Sidon there was an ancient royal family whose origin must have been coeval with that of the city; its reign was interrupted more than once; but at moments of crisis its existence was remembered, and some member of the ancient house was sought out to put an end to intestine quarrels and the contests of pretenders. The life of Tyre seems to have been more troubled than that of Sidon. Tradition has handed down to us the names of several of her kings, but as a rule she seems, like the Carthaginians and the Jews before the time of Saul, to

have preferred *suffetes* or judges, two of whom held power at once.

But whatever title they enjoyed, whether they were hereditary princes or consuls appointed for a time or for life, their power must always have been more than a little precarious. Remember the doges of Venice and Genoa! the true masters of the city were the heads of the principal families, or, to speak more accurately still, of the chief commercial houses. In Phœnicia, as at Carthage and in the Italian republics, the creators of the national wealth and the employers of the national labour formed, under one name or another, a species of senate.[1] They all had experience of affairs and habits of command. Each of them counted his ships by dozens, and his sailors, workmen, and agents by hundreds. One of these merchants would have a monopoly of trade to some country far larger than Phœnicia; another might work tin or gold mines in some distant island of the north or west. The interests of the nation were therefore bound up with those of the shipowners, who offered it a continually widening field for its energies, and with those of its manufacturers, who provided the materials for profitable exchanges. There was no question bearing upon the future prosperity of the people in which the rich merchants and shipowners of the country—who knew personally every shore and every nation of the Mediterranean—were not the best guides, and a council composed of such men could not fail, in time, to gather all real power into its hands. It was in such a council that all questions of importance were discussed and decided.

Even when they had kings the Phœnician cities were in reality small aristocratic republics. It was in Phœnicia that municipal liberty made its first appearance in the ancient world and that it first gave evidence of its inherent power. It created what the great oriental states, or rather agglomerations of men, had never known, namely, the citizen, the individual citizen, full of pride in the independence of his narrow fatherland, full of ambition for

[1] ARISTOTLE, who was a great admirer of Carthage, insists upon the oligarchic character of her constitution and upon the importance it gave to wealth and to those who possessed it (*Politics*, ii. viii. 5). "It was the opinion of the Carthaginians that he who should exercise public functions should have not only great qualities but also great riches; they thought that a man without fortune would not have the leisure necessary to make him successful as a governor of men."

himself and for her. By enforcing on each individual a sense of his own personal value, this *régime* made him capable at certain critical moments of extraordinary devotion and energy. "Tyre was the first town to defend its autonomy against those redoubtable monarchies which, from their seats on the Tigris and Euphrates, threatened to extinguish all life on the shores of the Mediterranean. When all the rest of Phœnicia had bent to the tempest, the dwellers on this isolated rock alone held the mighty Assyrian machine in check, and after supporting hunger and thirst for years had their reward in seeing the hosts of Shalmaneser and Nebuchadnezzar decamp from the neighbouring plain. A modern traveller cannot stand upon the mole which has made Tyre a peninsula without remembering with emotion that she was once the last bulwark of liberty."[1]

Thanks to this heroic resistance Tyre appears to the eyes of the historian the chief representative of the ambitions of Phœnicia and of the part she was called on to fill in the world; but she was not the first to open the sea routes; and even when every distant harbour was filled with her ships, even when her sailors excelled all their rivals in coûrage and enterprise, they were never alone in the work. Phœnicia never had what we should call a capital. During the Roman period Tyre and Sidon disputed the title of metropolis, that is, of *mother city* and foundress of Phœnician civilization.[2] Tyre could boast of the more glorious services, Sidon of the greater antiquity. The earliest maritime enterprises and the first factories established in foreign countries dated from the hegemony of Sidon. Like all the rest of Phœnicia, Sidon had accepted without resistance the sovereignty of the Theban Pharaohs, when they were masters of Syria; but the tribute paid to them by the Phœnicians was no heavy price to pay for the right of frequenting the Delta ports. The relations thus established with Egypt secured, in fact, a double monopoly to the Phœnicians. Almost everything drawn by Egypt from the markets of Asia, whether raw material or manufactured articles, passed through their hands; while, *per contra*, the export trade of the Nile valley was carried on almost entirely through them; from such a state of things, clever traders like the Phœnicians must have reaped enormous profits. Moreover the empire of

[1] RENAN, *Mission de Phénicie*, p. 574.

[2] STRABO, xvi. ii. 22.

Thothmes and Rameses was then the first military power of the world, and it must have been a great advantage for the Phœnicians to be able to claim at need the protection of those princes or of their generals. On the high seas they might, as we should phrase it, fly the Egyptian flag, and cover themselves with its prestige.[1]

Favoured thus by a vassalage which hardly affected their freedom, the Sidonians began by visiting all the eastern coasts of the Mediterranean. In the north they established themselves upon the southern littoral of Asia Minor; they took up strong positions in the islands of Cyprus and Crete, whence it was easy to make the coasts of Rhodes and the Sporades on the one hand, and of the Cyclades on the other, without losing the last glimpse of land.[2] They seem to have appeared very early at Thera (Santorini), at Melos (Milo), and at many other points in the archipelago. They may even have mounted thence to the Thracian islands, to Thasos, whose mines they worked so long.[3] We may even believe that they passed the Hellespont and penetrated to the Euxine, to bring from its farther shores the copper and iron of the Chalybes, and the tin of the Caucasus. In no part of the Hellenic main-land was their influence more strongly felt than in Bœotia. This is proved by the myth of Cadmus, or "the Oriental" (from *kedem*, east), who is said to have imported the alphabet into Greece, and to have founded the city of Thebes.[4] In the Peloponnesus, their presence is to be traced in Argolis; but it was in the island of Cythera, off Laconia, that they were chiefly established. There they set up

[1] On the presence of the Phœnicians in Egypt and the part they played there, see the interesting observations of BRUGSCH (*Histoire de l'Égypte*, pp. 142-150). He shows that the Tyrians were something more than stranger merchants kept outside the ordinary framework of Egyptian society. In papyri dating from the nineteenth dynasty there are many examples of Semitic names borne by officials of Pharaoh's court. The same writer shows that a certain number of gods of Asiatic origin were then introduced into the Egyptian pantheon. Of these the chief were Reshep, Bes, Kadesh, and Anta.

[2] DIODORUS has preserved the tradition of these relations between Rhodes and the east. He makes Danaus and the Egyptians, Cadmus and the Phœnicians visit that island (v. lviii. 1, 2). According to his story Cadmus left there a great bronze *lebes*, or cauldron, covered with Phœnician characters, as a mark of his visit.

[3] HERODOTUS, ii. 44; vi.

[4] Upon the establishment of the Phœnicians in Bœotia, see especially M. FR. LENORMANT'S paper entitled *La Légende de Cadmus et les Établissements phéniciens en Grèce* (8vo, 1867, Lévy).

factories whence their merchandize could flow readily into all the markets of the neighbouring peninsula.

Emboldened by success the Sidonians ventured to brave the terrors of the open sea, and penetrated into the second basin of the Mediterranean, the basin bounded on the west by Italy and Sicily. In Africa they built Utica and Kambe, on the site that was afterwards to become famous as that of Carthage; they braved the long rollers of the Adriatic, they touched at certain points in southern Italy and Sicily, and they took possession of Malta and Gozo, where they found excellent harbours of refuge in which their ships could rest and refit.[1]

About 1000 or 900 B.C. the supremacy passed from Sidon to Tyre.[2] Taken by the Philistines and sacked, the former town received a blow from which she took long to recover, but she had done so much for the interests and glory of Phœnicia that for a long time, both in Syria and in the east, the words Phœnician and Sidonian were looked upon as convertible terms. In their official acts the princes who reigned at Tyre called themselves kings of the Sidonians.[3] The first Tyrian kings of whom history says anything are Abibaal, the contemporary of David, and his son Hiram, the friend of Solomon. We find the names of several more in the Hebrew Scriptures and in the writings of the Greek and Roman historians, but their probable dates and sequence are often difficult to establish. It is certain, however, that Tyre continued the work of Sidon, and that, with greater energy and on a wider scale, the Tyrian colonies multiplied on the more fertile parts of the North African coast, and became rich and populous cities; among them were Hippo, Hadrumetium, Leptis, and, towards the year 800 B.C. "the new city," *Kart-hadast*, which the Greeks called Carchedon and the Romans Carthage.

Thanks to her splendid situation Carthage developed rapidly; but she never forgot that she was the daughter of Tyre. Every year a solemn embassy left the colony to sacrifice in the temple of Melkart, the most august of the metropolitan shrines.[4] After a successful war Carthage sent a tithe of the spoil to the same

[1] DIODORUS tells us that Malta and Gozo were colonized by the Phœnicians, but he does not tell us when (v. xii. 3, 4).

[2] JUSTIN, xviii. 3.

[3] PH. BERGER, *La Phénicie*, p. 7.

[4] POLYBIUS, xxxi. xx. 9, 12; CURTIUS, iv. ii. 8; DIODORUS, xx. xiv. 1.

temple.[1] If the two cities never combined for any great political action or even to resist a common enemy, their abstention was due to the distaste of the Phœnicians for such methods of work; but between the merchants of Tyre and those of Carthage close and intimate relations sprang up wherever they met. They were in continual correspondence, and at a word or glance they would combine to defeat the rivalry of foreign traders, such as the Greeks and Etruscans, and to keep profitable transactions to themselves. There was no necessity for agreements in writing or for binding oaths. Their co-operation was founded upon community of blood, of language and religion, of habits; and, above all, on that strongest of all ties, community of loves, hates, and interests.

In spite of the increasing prosperity of Carthage, Tyre remained for two centuries more the richest and most powerful of Phœnician cities. By the time its great African colony was founded Tyre had already begun to pervade the westernmost basin of the Mediterranean; she had visited all its shores and multiplied naval stations upon them. The great antiquity of the commercial relations between Italy and Tyre is proved by the words *Serranus*, *Sarranus*, which survived in the Latin language down to the classic period;[2] they are a corruption of the true Semitic form of the word Tyre, *Tsor*. *Tyrius*, a corruption from *Serranus*, did not begin to come into general use at Rome till much later, when the Latins had come under the influence of the Greeks, who had turned Tsor into Tyros (Τύρος). The presence and persistence of the form *Serranus* proves that the former people had been in close connection with Phœnicia, through the maritime trade of Tyre,[3] before intimate relations had sprung up between the natives of Italy and the Greeks. In the course of their movement westward the ships of Tyre put into the ports of the great island of Sardinia, where they found several useful metals in abundance. Their harbour was the magnificent anchorage of Caralis, now

[1] JUSTIN, xviii. 7; DIODORUS, xx. xiv. 2.

[2] VIRGIL, *Georgic II.* 505:

"Hic petit excidiis urbem miserosque Penates
Ut gemma bibat et Serrano dormiat ostro."

[3] We take this observation from W. Helbig's interesting paper on the discoveries made a few years ago at Præneste (*Cenni sopra l'arte fenicia*, p. 210, in the *Annales de l'Institut de Correspondance Archéologique*, 1878, pp. 197-257).

Cagliari, and they founded stations on the western coast which afterwards became the towns of Nora and Tharros.

From these ports the coasts of Spain could be easily reached, either by hugging the shores of Mauritania or by way of the Balearic Islands. To the Phœnicians the chief attraction of Spain lay in its mines, of which the more accessible seams had already perhaps been worked by the indigenous races. By following the coast southward and westward the Tyrian seamen would at last arrive at Calpe, whence they would look out on a boundless and unknown sea, suggesting that they had at last reached the end of the habitable world. The fears that seized them have sent an echo down even to our times. They could not repress the misgivings they felt at the long rollers of the Atlantic and at the swing of its tides; they hesitated on the threshold of the unknown. According to a tradition long current at Gades, it was only after having twice retreated that they at last nerved themselves to pass the straits and to land on the other side.[1] A third expedition, led by a bolder captain, founded on a small island close to the main-land the colony which was afterwards to become famous as Gadira, Gades and Cadiz.[2] By its situation and its houses tightly packed into a narrow space, Gadira must have reminded its founders of Tyre and Arvad. It became a fruitful nursery of hardy sailors and rapidly attained a prosperity that still excited the admiration of Strabo in the first century of our era.[3]

Its insular site made this advanced post secure enough, while its proximity to the main land made business easy. The Phœnician merchants soon established intimate relations with the people of Betica, the Turtes, Turditani or Turdules of the Greek and Latin historians. It has sometimes been suggested that a connection should be sought between the name of these people and the word Tarshish, which was certainly borrowed by the Hebrew writers from the Phœnicians.[4] We have some reason to believe, however, that at first the word Tarshish was applied by the Syrian navigators to southern Italy; with time it became

[1] STRABO, iii. v. 5.

[2] From the Phœnician word *gadir*, a "closed and fortified place." See FR. LENORMANT'S *Manuel de l'Histoire ancienne*, vol. iii. p. 58.

[3] STRABO, iii. i. 8; v. 3; DIODORUS, v. xx. 2.

[4] *Genesis* x. 4; 1 *Chronicles* i. 7; *Psalms* lxxii. 10; ISAIAH xxiii. 6, 10, 14; lxxi. 19; EZEKIEL xxvii. 12.

displaced, and as the horizon of the Phœnicians retired westwards so did the shores known to them by that name, which was never, in truth, very definite in its application. At the period when Phœnician power was at its zenith it signified generally the lands by which the Mediterranean was bordered on the west, just as to Europeans *the West Indies* meant for centuries the whole continent of America, north and south, with the islands which cluster about it.[1]

But whatever the origin of the name may have been, it is certain that Tarshish occupied a very large space in the minds of the Phœnicians. "They called those vessels that went long voyages *ships of Tarshish*, just as the English called theirs *Indiamen* even when they did not go near India."[2] These ships must have been more solidly built and of greater tonnage than those engaged in the coasting trade with the ports of Syria and the Ægæan, but unfortunately it is not their portraits that we must recognize in those sculptured reliefs of the Sargonid period in which Phœnician galleys are represented.[3] Some of these by their rounded stems and sterns seem to be cargo-carriers (Fig. 8), while others, with a sharp beak or ram, are "men-of-war" (Fig. 9); we can point to no monument on which the form and aspect of

[1] FR. LENORMANT, *Tarschisch, Étude d'Ethnographie et de Géographie biblique* (*Revue des Questions historiques*, 1882, 1st July).

[2] PH. BERGER, *La Phénicie*, p. 32. The phrase "ships of Tarshish" is thus employed in several passages of the Bible (1 Kings x. 23; 2 Chronicles ix. 31), where actual voyages to Tarshish cannot be referred to, as the question of the moment is the traffic with Ophir, which was carried on by the Red Sea. We may conclude that the expression has the same generic force in this verse from EZEKIEL (xxvii. 25): "The ships of Tarshish did sing of thee in thy market; and thou wast replenished, and made very glorious in the midst of the seas."

[3] We are enabled to recognize Phœnician galleys in these sculptured ships by the words of the inscription known as *The Annals of Sennacherib*, where it is related that in order to reach the rebels from Lower Chaldæa, who had taken refuge in the land of Elam, Sennacherib crossed the Persian Gulf in *vessels of Syria*. The truth of this is, in all probability, that he caused a flotilla to be built by Phœnician carpenters, on the Lower Euphrates, whence he could descend towards the "great sea of the rising sun." The bas-reliefs discovered by Sir Henry Layard must be understood as dealing with the return of the rebels as captives. "The men of Bit-Yaken with their gods and the men of Elam, I captured them, says Sennacherib, I did not leave one. I embarked them in vessels and transported them to the opposite shore." M. Oppert has furnished us with a translation of this text, which appears in *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, vol. i. p. 40, line 31 *et seq.*

the ship of Tarshish, the Phœnician Indiaman or clipper, has been preserved.

The profits of the trade with Spain were so large and so nimble that the whole eastern coast of the peninsula was soon studded



FIG. 8.—Phœnician merchant galley. From Layard.

with Phœnician settlements. The chief of these were Malaca (*Malaga*), Sex (*Motril*), Abdera (*Almeria*), and Carteïa (*Algeciras*); others of less importance might be named, or, at least,



FIG. 9.—Phœnician war galley. From Layard.

their situation guessed. The valleys of the interior and the fertile plains of the province we now call Andalusia supplied merchandise of various kinds to the Tyrian venturers, but the chief staple of the

FIG. 10.—Map of the Phœnician colonies in the Mediterranean basin.

trade was metal. "Tarshish," says Ezekiel in his address to Tyre,[1] "Tarshish was thy merchant by reason of the multitude of all kind of riches; with silver, iron, tin, and lead, they traded in thy fairs." Of all these metals doubtless the most important to the Phœnicians, and the most profitable, was tin. In the ancient world no substance was more universally employed than bronze, and without tin there can be no bronze. It was therefore an enormous advantage to the Phœnicians to have made themselves masters of the source whence that metal was to be obtained. The length of a sea voyage has far less effect upon the cost of merchandize than that of a land journey, so that throughout the Levant the tin brought over sea from Spain could be sold cheaper than the same metal brought over-land from central Asia. Such an advantage gave Phœnicia the control of the market and insured the fortune of her merchants.[2]

We give a map which will enable the reader to see at a glance how far the Phœnicians had carried their commerce in the eighth century B.C. The names of their principal settlements and naval stations are given, with every indication necessary to help to a clear comprehension of the several parts played by Tyre and Sidon in the creation of a great chain of colonies, of which some of the less important links have faded altogether from history[3] (Fig. 10).

The Tyrians were well inspired to seek these new outlets for their energies in the west of Europe, for in the other direction they saw markets closed to them in which they had once had a monopoly. Greece was developing fast; her population was growing and beginning to give evidence of a love for maritime commerce. In the two or three centuries which followed the supercession of Sidon by Tyre the Phœnician merchants had every day to struggle harder to maintain their position in the

[1] EZEKIEL xxvii. 12.

[2] As to the profits accruing to the Phœnicians from their control of the mines in the Iberian peninsula, see DIODORUS, v., xxxv. 3-6; xxxviii. 2-4. He is speaking chiefly of silver, but he adds that "tin was found in many parts of the peninsula." In these days the chief metallic products of Spain and Portugal are iron, copper, and especially argentiferous lead. Veins of tin are known, but they are not rich enough to pay for the working.

[3] We borrow this map from M. Maspero. The letter G at the end of a name indicates a colony from Gebal, S one from Sidon, and T one from Tyre. But some of these attributions are by no means certain.

Ægæan. Their goods were still bought, but they were no longer the sole purveyors of all those things by which life is made comfortable and luxurious; they could no longer add the profits of piracy to those of trade; the practice of kidnapping girls and boys and selling them into slavery[1] had to be given up as soon as the people of the islands learnt to build ships for themselves, and to retain the mastery of their own ports. The rich silver mines of Siphnos and Cimolos were no longer worked for the benefit of strangers to the soil. The isolated situation of Thasos enabled the Phœnicians to maintain themselves there to a later period, but at the beginning of the eighth century they were chased even thence by a colony of Parians.[2] Long before this Miletus and her colonies had closed the straits to them, and under the Saite princes the Ionians began to compete with them for the trade of Egypt. About the same period the Greeks established themselves first in Italy and soon afterwards in Sicily. Archias, at the head of a numerous band of Corinthians and Corcyrans, founded Syracuse in 733; the rest of the same coast was almost monopolized by other Greek settlements. All the Phœnicians had left to them was the western extremity of the island, with the three towns known to the Greeks as Motya, Kepher, afterwards called Solunte, and Machanath, or Panormus.

And, as if all the world were banded against Phœnicia, life became at the same time more precarious on the Syrian coast. After the disappearance of the Ramessids, Egypt, enfeebled and divided, retreated within herself, and her armies no longer appeared in Syria. Phœnicia lost much by the removal of that Egyptian suzerainty which had been a protection to her rather than a hindrance; its disappearance left her without defence against the daily increasing ascendency of Assyria. From the ninth century onwards she paid annual tribute to the kings of Nineveh.

Why did she fail to accommodate herself to the domination of Assyria as she did to that of Egypt, and afterwards to that of the

[1] HERODOTUS, i. 1; HOMER, *Odyssey*, xv. 415-484.

[2] We have no good reason for doubting the date given by DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS as that of the establishment of the Parian colony, viz., the Fifteenth Olympiad, 720-717 (Conf. CLEM. ALEXAND. *Stromata*, i. 21, p. 398). See G. PERROT, *Mémoire sur l'Ile de Thasos*, in the *Archives des Missions*, vol. i., 2nd series, 1864.

Achæmenids? The reason is to be sought no doubt in the fact that the Assyrian conquerors were imbued with a religious fanaticism, a sternness of tyranny and a greediness, which hurt both the interests and the pride of the Tyrians; the tribute claimed was too heavy, and the gods who had guarded the Phœnician mariners for so many centuries saw their temples dishonoured by the truculent votaries of Assur. But however this may be the fact remains that, although the other Phœnician cities submitted as a rule to the Assyrian generals as soon as they appeared in the country, Tyre held out against them again and again. More than once, and for years at a time, she defied the whole power of Sargon and Shalmanezer V. Sennacherib, indeed, succeeded in forcing a king of his own choice upon her, and, under the last princes of his dynasty, she seems to have accepted her lot as a vassal. After the fall of Nineveh, when a Babylonian empire succeeded to that of Assyria, Phœnicia made haste to secure the alliance of Judæa, and still more of Egypt, against the new masters of the east. At this moment a new life was breathed into the Nile kingdom by the princes of the Saite dynasty, and the desire to reconquer her ancient ascendency in Syria took hold upon her. But unhappily her Pharaoh, Apries, was defeated and Jerusalem taken, while Tyre was blockaded for thirteen long years by the armies of Nebuchadnezzar. But as the island city still retained command of the sea, she in the end compelled the Chaldæans to treat with her and raise the siege[1] (574 B.C.). A blockade so prolonged must have had a destructive effect upon Tyrian commerce. No merchandize could reach the city over land, her factories must have stood idle, her sailors must have been drawn from their proper trade to the work of war. The less stubborn Sidon must have profited by the enforced idleness of her rival to resume her ancient supremacy. But it was, indeed, a critical period for the whole of Phœnicia. While she was engaged in military and political resistance to the Ninevites and

[1] Governed by the wish to show that prophecy was fulfilled, most ecclesiastical authors have tried to make out that Nebuchadnezzar took and sacked Tyre; but Phœnician annals deny in the most formal manner that Tyre was ever taken by the Chaldæans (MASPERO, *Histoire ancienne*, p. 503, No. 2). M. BERGER inclines to the same opinion. "The issue of the siege seems doubtful. The allusions to it in the sacred writings are ambiguous. But from certain other evidence it would seem that on this occasion also Tyre foiled her enemies, and that Nebuchadnezzar was obliged to come to terms" (*La Phénicie*, p. 10).

Babylonians, her merchants were supplanted in many markets by those of Greece and Etruria.

After the fall of Babylon Cyrus became sole master of western Asia, and the Phœnicians, like the Jews, made haste to accept the Persian rule. The Achæmenids had no religious fanaticism; they left a large measure of liberty to the subject peoples of their empire, and their monetary exactions were moderate.[1] They were especially tender with the Phœnicians. The Persians had no navy, and they required one for their contest with Greece; they could not reckon on any cordial co-operation from the cities of Ionia, but two strong inducements led the Phœnicians to give the help required. In the first place the direct profit was great; a never-ceasing stream of darics poured into their ports to pay for their ships of war and their hardy crews. Secondly, they had an opportunity for taking some kind of revenge on those enterprising rivals who had for centuries past been narrowing the field of their commerce. Down to the time of the Macedonian conquest the kings of Persia had no subjects more faithful than the Phœnicians.

History mentions but one case of refusal to co-operate with the Persians on the part of the Syrian coast towns; and that was when Cambyses, fresh from the conquest of Egypt, wished to undertake an expedition against Carthage. The Phœnicians, says Herodotus, declared that it was quite impossible that they should take part in any such campaign, "because the most sacred oaths bound them to the Carthaginians, and in fighting against their own children they would be violating both ties of blood and scruples of religion."[2] Such a scruple did honour both to their heads and hearts. At the end of the sixth century Carthage was on the high road to the foundation of a colonial power in the Mediterranean of which the mother city might well be proud, and it was impossible that the latter should help to nip it in the bud or to hinder the development of a commercial prosperity in which, thanks to the intimate relations that subsisted between the ports of Africa and those of Syria, Tyre and Sidon would be certain to share.

The fortune of Carthage was made by her distance from the

[1] HERODOTUS (iii. 91) does not tell how much of the tribute of 350 talents which the fifth satrapy (Syria and the island of Cyprus) had to pay, fell to the share of Phœnicia.

[2] HERODOTUS, iii. 19.

principal centres of Greek civilization. While the two eastern basins of the Mediterranean became Greek seas, at least in their northern portion, as early as the end of the eighth century, Carthage had the western basin pretty well to herself; in it the Greek colonies were at no time either very numerous or very powerful; they were too far from their base.

The supremacy Carthage then acquired she was not to lose until, in the third century before our era, the Roman people entered upon the full political inheritance of Greece; and before the hour of her fall arrived she had time to play a part in the world whose importance and originality deserve to be brought into strong relief. "By its geographical situation the city of Dido belonged to Africa and the west; by its manners, by its language, by its civilization and the descent of its inhabitants, it belonged to Asia and the east. It was an outpost of Asiatic civilization pushed forward into the western Mediterranean; it was through Carthage that, in Africa, in Gaul, in Spain, even in the British Islands, oriental modes of life and thought preceded those of Greece and Rome."[1]

The country in which Carthage and those other Syrian colonies whose names we have mentioned were established, was afterwards the *African province* of the Romans, and is now Tunis, a province *de facto* of France. Its fertility is well known. The Phœnicians found it inhabited by a mixed population in which a race of Egyptian blood, the ancestors of the modern Berbers, are supposed to have predominated. The superior intelligence and higher skill of the Syrians soon gave them an influence over the native tribes—an influence which came all the easier, perhaps, by reason of some distant affinity of blood. They introduced better methods of agriculture, an industry which, like all others, had been carried very far on the Syrian coast. In the neighbourhood of Tyre and Sidon M. Renan found abundant evidence that the Phœnicians carried on their tillage with far better tools than those now in use in the country.[2] In Africa the plains were very different both in size and in quality of soil from those on the narrow shores of Palestine. Wheat soon became an important article of export; and the peasants of the interior rapidly learnt the language spoken by the merchants to whom they carried their

[1] FR. LENORMANT, *Manuel de l'Histoire ancienne*, vol. iii. p. 153.

[2] E. RENAN, *Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 633, 634 and 639; plate xxxvi.

grains and fruits in exchange for the stuffs, tools and jewellery sold in the city bazaars. These relations continued for centuries without interruption, and in time produced the mixed but strongly Semitic race of men whom the Greeks called Liby-Phœnicians.

It was by the help of these half breeds that Carthage succeeded in an enterprise which Tyre had not even attempted. In two hundred years, from the end of the ninth to the end of the seventh centuries, she conquered, foot by foot, the whole of the region stretching from the Lesser Syrtes to the frontier of Numidia; and her occupation was not confined to the littoral; she founded, in the interior, a number of towns and fortified villages whose fidelity to the metropolis, like that of the Roman colonies in Italy, was secured by the enjoyment of important privileges.[1] The earlier Tyrian colonies had been nothing more than factories with supremacy over the land in their immediate neighbourhood, while the skilful policies of Carthage soon made her the mistress of a wide and fruitful territory supporting several millions of inhabitants. As for the other Tyrian and Sidonian cities on the same coast, they preserved for the most part the dignity implied by the name of allies, but Carthage was the permanent mistress of the confederacy and the disposer of its forces.

Neither Tyre nor Sidon ever had an army. In most cases they founded their settlements in islands to which the sea was a sufficient protection, and nothing more than a few ships to guard the straits was required. When they were compelled to raise factories on the main land, they surrounded them with a wall strong enough and high enough to defeat a *coup-de-main*, while they paid an annual subsidy to the chiefs of the nearest tribes,[2] just as our modern merchants did on the coast of Guinea whenever they wished to set up their establishments on the lands of some negro king. In these days the subsidies take the form of beads, barrels of rum or gunpowder and old muskets. The Phœnicians can have had no difficulty in supplying the natives

[1] "It is thus," says ARISTOTLE, "that Carthage guards against the dangers of an oligarchy—she sends periodically colonies made up from among her own citizens into the countries round about, and insures them an easy existence."—*Politics*, ii. viii. 9.

[2] "*Statuto annuo vectigali pro solo urbis*," says JUSTIN (xviii. 5). He even says that Carthage herself paid such a subsidy for more than three centuries, which hardly seems likely (xix. 1 and 2).

with such things as they prized. Wine, for instance, must have been as greatly sought for as spirits are now. True to their national habits, the Tyrians preferred to buy a few acres of land in this fashion, than to take them by force and defend them with the sword.

Carthage found herself compelled by events to take another line; as soon as she had conceived the desire to possess the surrounding country an army became necessary, and she found the first elements of it in the very native tribes for whose subjection it was intended. The liberal pay which she could so easily offer attracted recruits from all the races by which her own territories and those of her neighbours were peopled. She enrolled Liby-Phœnicians, Numidians and Moors, while her own citizens fashioned the rough material thus provided into efficient fighting units. Her army was at first purely African, but in later years, when she embarked on her great conflicts with the Sicilian Greeks and the Romans, she had to turn for help to all who chose to live by the profession of arms, and of all the people who dwelt on the Mediterranean coast, there was not one, speaking broadly, that was unrepresented in the great regiments of mercenaries with which Hamilcar, Hasdrubal and Hannibal disputed the empire of the world with Rome.

But long before she could put these great hosts into the field, that is, at the beginning of the sixth century, Carthage had what no Phœnician city had possessed before her, namely, a wide territory and a standing army. She was, therefore, in a condition to make the best of her opportunities when the long duel between Tyre and Babylon prevented the former city, for ten years and more, from supporting her stations beyond the sea. Disquieting events were taking place in every direction. In Betica the Turdetani had risen, had attacked the Phœnician settlements, and had massacred the African colonists whom Tyre had established in the valley of the Betis. And the gravity of the crisis was increased by the fact that the hand of Greece was felt behind it. As early as 640 Coleos of Samos had pushed a hardy prow as far as these distant coasts, and, favoured by fortune, had returned to vaunt the wonders of Betica and the treasures of Gades in his native island. From that day every Ionian captain had burned to reach Tartessos, as the Greeks called Tarshish. In making for Spain, a Greek of Phocæa, Euxenes by name, had landed in southern Gaul, not far

from the mouth of the Rhone, and founded Massilia. In 548 the Rhodians and Cnidians made the same attempt, and, landing on the north-east of the peninsula, founded Rhoda, now Rosas. But it was by the Phocæans that these explorations were most energetically carried out. It seems probable that the story told by Herodotus of the sudden affection for his foreign visitors that seized the king of Tartessos,[1] whom he calls Arganthonios, must date from the period of inaction forced upon Tyre by the blockades of Nebuchadnezzar. The Greeks perhaps were less greedy and more easy to get on with than their Syrian rivals, while fortune smiled here on their rising ambition as she did everywhere else. In Sicily the three cities still left to the Phœnicians were already threatened.

From one end of the Mediterranean to the other every Phœnician colony and every Phœnician merchant began to turn beseeching glances towards Carthage; if Carthage refused to take up the broken policy of Tyre the whole fabric of Phœnician commerce was threatened with rapid extinction. Carthage responded to the appeal and proved herself equal to the work that had to be done. She understood that the times had changed. As long as the Tyrians and Sidonians were confronted on every coast by nothing but savage and scanty populations, it was easy enough to insure the safety of their settlements. But the world had become peopled; the indigenous tribes had learnt the use of bronze and iron; finally a civilization, that of the Greeks, was to be encountered on every shore, was developing rapidly, and had already surpassed that of the Phœnicians in all matters of art and thought. A new situation called for new modes of action. Carthage did not hesitate a moment. She was not content with a defensive programme, by which she would have lost ground from year to year; she chose the aggressive. The time of monopolies was past, but by her energetic action she secured for three centuries more a privileged situation over the whole western basin of the Mediterranean.

"A great expedition was sent to Spain which relieved the coast cities, reconquered the valley of the Betis, and resumed those mineral districts whose possession was of such capital importance. A large number of Liby-Phœnicians were transported into the country and there established as colonists, to keep the native

[1] HERODOTUS, i. 163.

tribes in check. The system of government and colonisation which had been put in action in Zeugitania and Byzacènia was applied to Betica. In order to keep open their strategic and commercial communications with Spain by land as well as by sea, the Carthaginians occupied and fortified the towns, called Metagonites by the Greeks, which formed an unbroken chain along the whole coast of Mauretania as far as the pillars of Hercules. They had been founded by Tyre in the first instance as harbours of refuge and victualling stations for ships on their way to Gades and back. An intimate alliance was entered into with the Numidians, who were engaged to respect the ports established on their coasts —ports which served as recruiting stations for the Carthaginian armies among the warlike tribes in their neighbourhood." [1]

Encouraged by these first successes, the Carthaginians determined to cast an army into Sicily which might win the co-operation of the tribes in the interior, the Siculi and Sicani. These tribes were beginning to feel some apprehension at the rapid growth of the Greek colonies, which encroached yearly upon their narrow territory. The Carthaginians soon succeeded in making themselves masters of the western part of the island and of the interior, throwing the Greek colonists back on the northern and eastern coasts.[2] The towns which still belonged to the Syrian stock were relieved by the success of this bold policy; garrisons were thrown into them and they were put in an efficient state of defence. Where the Tyrians had left only watchers and warehouse-keepers, there the Carthaginians put soldiers.

A no less successful effort was made to reconquer the Phœnician supremacy in the waters that lie between Sardinia and the north-eastern coasts of Spain. In 556 the Phocæans founded the town of Alalia, or Aleria, on the eastern coast of Corsica, in a situation well chosen for the desired purpose of counteracting the advantages given to the Phœnicians by their possession of a part of Sardinia; it enabled its founders to command the whole of the Tyrrhenian Sea and the Ligurian Gulf. The capture and destruction of Phocæa by Harpagus in 547, at the time of the conquest of Ionia by the Persians, instead of ruining the Ionian possessions in the west, really added greatly to their importance.

[1] FR. LENORMANT, *Manuel d'Histoire ancienne*, vol. iii. p. 187.

[2] This we learn from a few short and rather vague sentences of JUSTIN (xviii. 7).

From a colony Massilia rose to be a metropolis;[1] fugitives from Phocæa, energetic men and skilful sailors, took refuge with the wealth they had saved, some in Massilia, others at Aleria. The effect of this reinforcement was soon felt. The Ionian colonists captured and destroyed the stations established by the Phœnicians on the coasts of Liguria and north-eastern Spain, while in more than one encounter their squadrons defeated those of Carthage. The superiority thus won they enjoyed for some time.[2]

The Greeks were, then, in a fair way to gather the trade with Spain into their own hands, and, tempted by the mines of Sardinia, they would be likely in time to wish to add that island to the colony they had begun to form in Corsica. Carthage could not be indifferent to such ambitions as these, and she determined to resume, if possible, her ascendency in the north, as she had resumed it in Betica and Sicily; and in the new enterprise she had the good fortune to find allies.

At this moment the Etruscans, that strange people whose origin and language are still a mystery, were at the height of their prosperity. Their nation as a whole had its seat in Tuscany, but Campania also had a few Etruscan cities, and as these two groups of a single people were separated by Latium, where the power of Rome was gradually extending itself, they required the command of the sea to enable them to communicate freely with one another. This freedom was compromised by the existence of the Ionian colony on the opposite coast of Corsica. It was natural then that Carthaginians and Etruscans, in both of whom similar apprehensions had been awakened by a single foe, should unite their forces against him. In 536 an Etruscan fleet sailed from Populonia, the chief port of Etruria, and, being joined by a fleet from Carthage, the combined squadrons turned their heads towards Aleria. The ensuing battle was won by the Ionians, but their numbers were so scanty that even victory was fatal. They abandoned Aleria and fled, some to Massilia, others to southern Italy, where they founded the colony of Velia.[3]

Corsica had neither the fertile plains nor the mineral wealth of Sardinia. The Carthaginians, after establishing a few naval

[1] LENORMANT, *Histoire ancienne*, vol. iii. p. 191.
[2] THUCYDIDES, i. 13; PAUSANIAS, x. viii. 4.
[3] HERODOTUS, i. 165-7; DIODORUS, v. xiii. 4.

stations, abandoned the rest of the island to the Etruscans.[1] But on the other hand they razed to the ground most of the towns built by the Ionians on the coast of Spain; they re-established themselves in Liguria, where the rock of Monaco was one of their fortresses. Massilia lived a precarious life until the great victory, won by Hiero, tyrant of Syracuse, over the Etruscans in 474, restored freedom of movement to the Greek colonists in the Gulfs of Lyons and Genoa. The Massilians seem never to have resumed the great enterprises of a century before; they were content to make the most of southern Gaul, and to leave Spain and the islands to the Phœnicians of Africa. By the force of events a tacit convention or formal agreement was entered into between these various commercial races; in the rapid multiplication of transactions there was profit for them all. The discovery at Marseilles of a table of charges, in the Punic language, for sacrifices in the temple of Baal, seems to prove that Carthage had a factory at Massilia. The tablet must have been engraved at Massilia, for the stone of which it consists has been recognized as that of a neighbouring quarry.[2]

Freed from the uneasiness inspired by the enterprise and armed competition of the Ionians, the Carthaginians set to work to complete their network of strategic positions in the western Mediterranean. After a check or two they finished the conquest of Sardinia, and, as in Africa, they favoured its agricultural development. "Under their rule the island reached a prosperity it has never seen since. Sardinia, which is now so thinly peopled, so wild, so unhealthy, was, when the Romans took possession of it after three centuries of Carthaginian domination, a rich and flourishing garden, with a large rural and urban population."[3]

Mago, the general who had brought the conquest of Sardinia to a happy conclusion, also succeeded in taking full possession of the Balearic group. In Minorca he founded a city which afterwards became one of the chief naval stations of the republic—a city which has preserved the name of its founder with but little

[1] DIODORUS, v. xii. 3, 4.

[2] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, part i. No. 164.

[3] FR. LENORMANT, *Manuel d'Histoire ancienne*, vol. iii. p. 197. According to DIODORUS (x. xv. 4) a few savage tribes continued to maintain their independence in the mountains, but the whole of the plains were occupied by the Carthaginian colonists.

alteration down to our own day, for Port *Mahon* is but a form of Port *Mago*.[1]

Towards the end of the sixth century, Carthage had established her supremacy over at least half the Mediterranean, but already her merchants and captains were beginning to find the boundaries of that land-locked sea too narrow for their energies. Her ships were every year becoming more ready to pass the Pillars of Hercules and to navigate the Atlantic. There the Tyrians had preceded them, but with less boldness. With a commission from the Carthaginian senate, a certain Hanno explored the coast of Africa as far as the eighth degree of south latitude.[2] As a result of that expedition the whole African coast from the straits to Cape Nun was colonized, more than three hundred settlements being established there, of which a few, such as Tingis (*Tangier*) and Sala (*Rabat*) are now represented by Moorish towns. Although most of these were abandoned, some retained a considerable commerce, such as Cerne (the island of Arguin), where great annual fairs used to be held.[3]

In the course of these explorations the Carthaginians discovered the Canaries and touched at Madeira.[4] "From a passage in Scylax, it would even appear that they attempted to push still farther west, and got as far as the *Mer des Sargasses* (?), but the quantity of weeds with which the surface of the waves was covered made them think it would be dangerous to venture farther, and they retraced their steps.[5] If the wars against the Sicilian Greeks and the Romans had not come to distract the

[1] According to DIODORUS the Balearic Islands supported a large Phœnician population by the side of their indigenous tribes.

[2] The official report of Hanno's voyage, which was deposited in the temple of Baal-Ammon at Carthage, has been preserved to us in its entirety by a Greek translation. See the *Geographi Græci Minores*, Muller's edition (Didot, vol. i. part i.), and the two maps prepared by that learned editor for the illustration of the text.

[3] SCYLAX, *Periple* (?), 112.

[4] This we may infer from many texts which it would take too long to discuss. Among them is a passage in DIODORUS, in which he gives a brilliant description of a fertile and well-watered island, with a delicious climate, which was situated "opposite Africa, in the ocean to the west, and separated from the main land by several days' sail" (v. xix.). After its discovery by the Phœnicians they paid periodical visits to it, he tells us, down to a very late period (v. xx.).

[5] FR. LENORMANT, *Manuel d'Histoire ancienne*, vol. iii., p. 200; SCYLAX, *Periple*, 112.

attention of Carthage, a Phœnician Columbus might have discovered America twenty centuries before that event actually took place. We know that a Tyrian captain, subsidized by Nechao, king of Egypt, anticipated Vasco de Gama and circumnavigated Africa about the year 600 B.C.[1]

While Hanno steered towards the South Atlantic, another commander, Himilco, made his way north, reconnoitring the western coasts of Spain and Gaul and touching the British Isles.[2] It has been said that the Tyrians also reached those coasts, but no evidence that they did so has been adduced. On the other hand we know that, during the Carthaginian period, ships of Gades went to an archipelago which they named the *Cassiterides*, or "tin islands." These were the Scilly Islands, to whose inhabitants they gave salt, bronze vases, arms and pottery in exchange for hides and metal.[3] No doubt they landed at several points on the coast of Cornwall and Ireland, but according to their usual habits, they preferred to establish themselves on small islands, where their safety was more assured. There they would set up markets to which the tribes on the main-land could bring any merchandize they had to dispose of.[4]

This Atlantic trade was a monopoly. The Carthaginians spared no pains to keep away competitors. Their pilots jealously guarded their knowledge of the prevailing winds, of the currents and anchorages, while they spread such reports as to the difficulties and dangers of the navigation as would discourage any but the most dauntless souls. When a foreign captain refused to be frightened and attempted to follow the track of a Carthaginian ship, the crew of the latter were ready for any extreme, either of cruelty or enterprise, to choke him off and preserve the national secrets. If they felt themselves to be the stronger party, they would turn upon their pursuer and put him and his crew to death ;[5] if inferior strength made this impossible they would risk

[1] HERODOTUS, ii. 42.

[2] The report of Himilco has not been preserved, but some of its facts appear to have been utilized in the Latin poem of *Festus Avienus*.

[3] STRABO, iii. v. 11.

[4] Without naming the Carthaginians, DIODORUS tells us that the inhabitants of the south-western extremity of Great Britain had their habits and manners much softened by their intercourse with the strangers who came to their shores for tin.

[5] APPIAN, *Punica*, 5 ; STRABO, xvii. i. 19.

their own existence to mislead their rival. Strabo tells us of the Phœnician captain who, seeing himself followed by a Roman ship along the western coast of Spain, deliberately steered upon a shoal, where his ship perished and with it the Roman galley. The Phœnician captain managed to swim ashore, and on his return to his own country he was rewarded for his heroism and ready resource with the full value of his lost ship and cargo.[1]

Such proceedings would not do in Italian waters. There the Carthaginians had to be content with admission to the ports on equal terms with Greeks and Etruscans. At a very early hour they had been compelled to renounce all idea of retaining a footing on the soil of the peninsula, and to content themselves with taking up positions which gave them ready access to it, as, for instance, on the island of Lipari, whence they could keep a watch upon the Straits of Messina and the whole coast of Southern Italy. These advanced posts they could make the bases both of trade and piracy. From the former very large profits were still to be won, as Carthage had a practical monopoly in the supply of African and oriental objects to European markets. They entered into commercial treaties. Aristotle had heard of treaties concluded between the Etruscans and the Carthaginians,[2] and Polybius has preserved for us the text of the first convention signed between Carthage and Rome, the latter signing for her Latin allies, and the former for her own metropolis; this was in 509, the year of the expulsion of the Tarquins.[3] The excavations made in Etruria and Latium are continually affording evidence in support of these historical statements. In the cemeteries of both countries a large number of objects have been found which, speaking figuratively, bear the stamp of Carthage.

It was at about this period that the wealth and greatness of Carthage were at their zenith, and that her affairs were most skilfully managed. We shall not follow her into her wars against the Greeks of Sicily, which went on at the same time as the Medic wars in the East; still less shall we dwell upon that long duel with Rome in which she at last succumbed. Long before the day of her fall, long before the day of that great

[1] STRABO, iii. v. 11.

[2] ARISTOTLE, *Politics*, iii. v. 10.

[3] POLYBIUS, iii. 22.

disaster which recalled to Scipio and Polybius the melancholy lines of Homer, the supremacy of the Greek civilization was assured. The art of Greece had arrived at perfection by the middle of the fifth century. From that date onwards the Hellenic world drew from the East nothing but raw material, to which it gave forms so superior to those hitherto known that they soon imposed themselves on every neighbouring people. Carthage no more escaped the action of this powerful rivalry than the Phœnician towns of Syria. In the middle of the fourth century the throne of Tyre was occupied by that Strato whose passion for all that was Greek gave him the name of *the Phil-Hellene*. Something of the same kind went on at Carthage. The Carthaginians waged a murderous war against the Greeks of Sicily, but in the sequel they carried off the statues from their enemy's shrines, and set them up in the temples and public places of their own city.[1] They even copied the money of Greece, or rather they caused coins to be struck by Greek artists for their use (Figs. 11 and 12).[2] Finally, Greek architects found their way to Carthage long before Scipio and his legions. The temples which disappeared in the great conflagration, the shrines of Baal-Hammon and Tanit, cannot have preserved the look of Phœnician sanctuaries, they must have been reconstructed in the style made fashionable by the Greek artists of the time of Alexander and his successors; at least we may fairly conclude that it was so from the fact that the military harbour was decorated with columns of the Ionic order.[3] Not the slightest fragment of these structures has come down to our time; but we find a trace of Greek influence even in the ornaments with which those steles

[1] APPIAN, *Punica*, 133; CICERO, *In Verrem, De Signis*, XXXV.

[2] For the chronology of the Carthaginian coinage see FR. LENORMANT, *Essai sur la Propagation de l'Alphabet phénicien dans l'ancien Monde*, vol. i. p. 156-161. The two specimens which we reproduce are thus described by DE SAULCY (in the notes to M. Duruy's *Histoire romaine*, vol. i. p. 419 and 420, and from which we borrow these two figures): 11. Obv. Head of the nymph Arethusa; Rev. Pegasus. The legend BARAT signifies *the wells*, or perhaps more accurately Bi ARAT, *at the wells*, the Punic name for Syracuse, which possessed the famous well of Arethusa. Large silver piece, certainly struck in Sicily, and probably at Syracuse.—12. Obv. Head of Arethusa. Rev. A horse supported by a palm-tree; an especially Carthaginian type. Sub-division of No. 11. The inscription on both has the same signification, so that the two coins must have originated in Sicily. Electrum.

[3] Κίονες δ' ἑκάστου νεωσοίκου προὔχον Ἰωνικοὶ δύο. . . APPIAN, *Punica*, 96.

consecrated to Tanit, of which such vast numbers have been discovered within the last few years, were decorated.[1]

In these curious monuments we find architectural motives thoroughly Greek in character reproduced side by side with forms and symbols that can only be explained by the Phœnician religion. Pavilions in which the figure of a worshipper (Fig. 13)



FIG. 11.—Carthaginian coin. Silver.

or a collection of sacred emblems (Fig. 14) are inclosed have triangular pediments supported by fluted pilasters, the latter crowned with Ionic capitals. There are acroteria at the three angles of the pediment. These acroteria appear again at the angles of a pediment in which we find the tympanum occupied by a mother-goddess (Fig. 15). Here the proportions of the

FIG 12.—Carthaginian coin. Electrum.

pediment are not Greek, but, on the other hand, the cornice below is decorated with a well marked egg-moulding. In one of the most curious of these little monuments we encounter a clearly defined Ionic capital surmounted by a crescent moon, which supports in its turn a bust of Tanit. Above the face of the

[1] PH. BERGER, *Lettre à M. Fr. Lenormant sur les Représentations figurées des Stèles puniques de la Bibliothèque nationale* (*Gazette archéologique*, 1876-7).

goddess a row of oves and arrow-heads may be distinguished (Fig. 16). None of this is very pure either in form or proportion, but except in such symbols as the crescent moon, it includes nothing to remind us of Egypt or Assyria, nothing in fact that we can call Phœnician.

In order to follow the history of Carthage in the west and to trace her career down to the moment when her civilization became blended in that of Greece and Rome, we have for the



FIG. 13.—Votive stele from Carthage. French National Library.

moment lost sight of Tyre and Sidon. We must now return to them, for neither the Persian nor even the Macedonian conquest crushed the genius and prosperity of the industrious race by which they were inhabited. The Persian sovereignty had been accepted as a deliverance, and to the Persian kings the Phœnicians had given the assistance of their fleets in suppressing the revolts which broke out, every now and again, in Ionia, Cyprus, and Egypt. But their fidelity began to waver towards the middle

of the fourth century, when the empire of the Achæmenids seemed on the point of dissolution. In 316, under Ochus, Sidon



FIG. 14.—Votive stele from Carthage. French National Library.

rose and massacred its Persian garrison. Betrayed by her king Tennes, she was retaken, reduced to ashes, and her inhabitants sold for slaves.[1]



FIG. 15.—Votive stele from Carthage. French National Library.

Again, after the battle of Issus (B.C. 333), Byblos, Arvad, Sidon,

[1] DIODORUS, xvi., 41-45. Diodorus places these events three or four years too soon. According to him, the submission of Egypt and Phœnicia took place between

and the other cities of the coast hastened to submit to the conqueror. Tyre alone listened to her pride rather than to her interests. She was ready to acknowledge herself the vassal of Macedonia on the same terms as those granted by Persia, but she refused to allow Alexander to march at the head of his guard through those gates which had never yet been passed by a conqueror. She paid dearly for her resistance. After a siege of

FIG. 16.—Fragment of a votive stele from Carthage. French National Library.

seven months she was taken and sacked. The mole by which the besiegers joined her to the mainland changed her situation for ever. She was no longer an island. To be mistress of the seas no longer sufficed to make her impregnable.

351 and 348. But GROTE gives us very good reasons for believing that neither Egypt nor Phœnicia can have been reduced before 346 and 345 (*History of Greece*, vol. xi. p. 443, n. 3, and 441 n. 3).

Thenceforward Tyre also had to abandon the great ambitions renounced long before by the other cities of the coast, and the Phœnicians, as a whole, had to be content with the status of merchants; merchants better informed, readier at a bargain, at once more enterprising, more wary, more economical, and richer than their rivals, but still only merchants; subjects now of the Ptolemies, now of the Seleucidæ, and, finally, of the Roman emperors, they had stations everywhere, at Alexandria and Athens, at Corinth and Antioch, and later at Puteoli in Italy. In all these towns they dwelt in their own quarter, they used among themselves their native Semitic language, they had their own temples and forms of worship; like the Jews and Armenians in modern Turkey, they formed a nation apart, devoted to gain. From the time that Greek art imposed itself upon all civilized nations they ceased to play a useful part as the disseminators of plastic types and industrial methods; but in other respects their mission was not yet fulfilled. During the two first centuries of our era their dispersed but strongly cohesive communities were among the most active agents in the diffusion of Christianity.[1]

§ 3.—*Religion.*

Our knowledge of the Phœnician religion is still very imperfect. The numerous inscriptions that have been found in recent years—they are for the most part dedications and fragments of ritual—have revealed the names of several deities previously unknown. A certain amount of information has also been gleaned by the study of onomatology, as nearly all the Phœnician proper names are what is called *theophori*, that is to say, composite words in which the name of a deity is included. Finally, we have a few fragments of Phœnician writings, and a considerable mass of information sprinkled over the works of Greek and Roman authors.[2] But,

[1] RENAN, *Les Apôtres*, pp. 295-303.

[2] MENANDER, who wrote a history of Phœnicia, was a native of Ephesus; but according to Josephus, to whom we owe the few fragments of his work which survive, he consulted Phœnician documents in the original (*Fragmenta Historicum Græcorum*, C. Muller, vol. iv. pp. 445-448). The remains of Sanchoniathon are to be found in the same collection, vol. iii. pp. 560-576. For the corrections that require to be made in the Greek text of these fragments, see several ingenious

in spite of the industry of modern criticism, many points are still obscure. The epigraphic texts are dry and short ; they explain nothing, and the analysis of proper names gives little after all but the titles of gods ; the existing fragments of Sanchoniathon bear traces of the syncretism of the decadence, and can only be utilized with considerable caution ; and when we turn to the materials left us by the classic authors we must do so with no less prudence and reserve. The latter only knew Phœnicia in its decline, when it was already more or less Hellenized. Moreover, they did not always comprehend what they saw and heard. Finally, they were content with comparisons which were often forced and inaccurate.[1]

Traces of that bent of thought which we encounter in all primitive societies and call fetishism may be found in the Phœnician religion. The mountains had their gods, or, to speak more exactly, they were worshipped as gods. Their imposing mass, the majesty of the black forests with which they were clothed, the voices of their torrents, their snowy summits and the depths of their narrow gorges, gave them a mysterious power over the imaginations of the people (Fig. 17). The worship of the mountain gods dates certainly from the first days of the Phœnician occupation ; its persistence is attested by the epithets we meet with in the Semitic texts, such as *Baal-Lebanon*, *Baal-Hermon*, and in Greek transcriptions like *Zeus-Casios*.[2] In the same spirit prayers and sacrifices were offered to rocks, to grottoes, to springs and rivers. The cavern whence the stream of the Nahr Ibrahim makes its " sudden sally " has been for thousands of years one of the most sacred spots in Syria. The temple of Astarte, developed into the Aphacan Aphrodite, was overthrown by Constantine, but it was restored after his day was past. The rites there performed doubtless dated back to the commencement of the Phœnician occupation. We cannot wonder that a religious sentiment was excited by this scene, one of the loveliest in the world

conjectures by J. HALÉVY, in his paper entitled: *Les Principes phéniciens* Πόθος *et* Μῶτ (in the *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1883, p. 36).

[1] Upon the nature and the inadequacy of our materials for the study of the Phœnician religion, see BERGER, *La Phénicie*, pp. 17-19.

[2] The Baal-Lebanon is mentioned in the oldest Phœnician inscription we possess, viz., the dedication engraved upon a bronze cup the fragments of which are now in the French National Library (*Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, part i., No. 5).

(Fig. 18).[1] Certain trees received homage of the same kind. Under the Zeus-Demarous of Philo of Byblos we may recognize the Phœnician form *Baal-Thamar*, "the Lord of the Palm-tree."[2]

The worship of betylæ, which we encounter in every country reached by Phœnician influence, may be traced to the same

FIG. 17.—Descent from the Pass of Legnia, in the Lebanon.

source. The word we have used above comes to us from the Greeks, and they took it with some slight alteration from the

[1] RENAN, *Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 296-301. Fig. 18, like 1 and 17, is borrowed from M. LORTET's beautiful work, *La Syrie d'Aujourdhui* (Hachette, 1884).

[2] BERGER, *La Phénicie*, p. 25. PHILO OF BYBLOS, Fragment i., 16-22. M. Berger's explanation of the Ζεύς Δημάρους of Philo is probable and ingenious, but the group *Baal-Thamar* has never yet been found in a Phœnician text.

FIG. 18.—The sources of the River Adonis

Semitic group *Beth-el*, which means, "the house of God."[1] This was a generic term used to denote all sacred stones, that is to say, all stones credited with the possession of any special and peculiar virtue. The form of these stones and the degree of respect in which they were held varied greatly. As a rule they were either conical or ovoid, but sometimes they were pyramidal, and, in a few sanctuaries, they were squared shafts with smooth faces. We are told that some were aërolites, a circumstance which greatly enhanced their credit.

The diffusion of Greek arts and ideas did not cause the worship of these stones to fall into disuse. Under the Roman emperors

FIG. 19.—Coin of Byblos; enlarged. From Donaldson's *Architectura Numismatica*.

it was more popular than ever. In the time of Tacitus, Astarte, then called Aphrodite, was figured on a cone in the chief temple at Paphos,[2] and so, at Byblos, was the great goddess of that place. This we may see from the reverse of a coin of Byblos, struck under Macrinus. The sacred stone rises in the middle of a court surrounded by a portico (Fig. 19). Another instance was

[1] This etymology has been contested by M. HALÉVY (*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, vol. iv. pp. 392-3), but his alternative proposal has not met with general acceptance. See also a dissertation by M. FR. LENORMANT, entitled, *Les Bétyles* (*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, vol. iii. pp. 31-53), as well as M. HEUZEY's paper: *La Pierre sacrée d'Antipolis* (*Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de France*, 1874).

[2] TACITUS, *History*, ii. 3.

the black stone of Emesus, of which Heliogabalus was priest before he was raised to the purple.[1]

It was, then, not only on the coast, it was over all Syria that these stones were worshipped, and that down to the last hours of paganism. It is a form of worship as old as the religious sentiment, and never, it would appear, has it flourished more than during the decline of the antique civilization.

Societies, like individuals, have their periods of dotage, and this was one. In the centuries to which we are transported by the oldest known monuments of Phœnician art and fragments of writing, the Phœnicians were no longer in the stage when the sole divinities are rocks, trees, and stones. Towards the close of the Sidonian period, when the ships of Tyre and Sidon were ploughing the Mediterranean in every direction, the rites and beliefs of Phœnicia, taking them as a whole, represented a condition of religious thought in advance of that we have studied in Egypt. There were no sacred animals; men were less preoccupied with the worship of the dead. Their adoration was chiefly addressed to the stars and to those great phenomena of nature which seemed to them to be the results of deliberate action on the part of some powerful and mysterious god. Their polytheism was more abstract, more advanced, even than that of Chaldæa; it was farther removed from the phase to which we give the name of polydemonism; their pantheon was less numerous, and its members were more concrete. Already, perhaps, the idea of a single supreme being was beginning to disengage itself from the conception of a crowd of distinct divinities, and the latter to sink into the condition of mere embodiments of the different moods and phases of a god in whom they were all summed up.

It has been sometimes thought that this supreme god should be recognized in the *Baal-Samaïm* or "Baal of the skies," to whom the great inscription of *Oum-el-Awamid* is dedicated;[2] but when we meet him elsewhere, in the island of Sardinia, for instance, it is

[1] "In the temple there is a large stone, rounded at the base, pointed at the top, conical in form, and black in colour; they say it fell from heaven."—HERODIAN, v. 5.

[2] BERGER, *La Phénicie*, p. 19; *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, part i. No. 7.

with a geographical epithet that takes away much of his general and superior character.[1]

In the immediate neighbourhood of Phœnicia, *i.e.* among the Jews, monotheism had, by the time of the Assyrian triumphs, reached its logical conclusion. The Phœnicians lived in intimate relations with the Jews, especially with those belonging to the kingdom of Israel; they spoke almost the same language; a native of Gebal or Sidon would have no difficulty in understanding the passionate invectives of an Elijah, an Elisha, or an Isaiah; and yet there is no evidence to prove that the words of those orators and poets ever found an echo in the cities of the Phœnician coast, or that the inhabitants of the latter associated themselves, even for a moment, with the great religious movement that was going on so near at hand. If certain expressions in the Phœnician texts seem to hint that, at Tyre as at Thebes, men sought now and then to raise themselves to the notion of a first cause, it is none the less true that in the Phœnician spirit, which did not take kindly to metaphysics, the notion in question was never anything more than a vague and fleeting aspiration.

The example set by the Greeks must have counted for much in this indifference. Certain gods and goddesses disembarked with the Phœnicians on all the coasts of Europe; it was to the Phœnicians that the antique world owed many of the divine types to which it was most attached. These types the Greek imagination clothed in more definite shapes and imbued with a warmer life than they had ever known before. As soon as the plastic genius of the Greeks arrived at its full development, the Phœnicians found themselves confronted, on every shore, by the gods whom they worshipped and whom their fathers had worshipped before them; and they found them transfigured by an incomparable art and lodged in temples which compelled admiration by the unequalled grandeur of their lines. Merchants and sailors, the greater part of their lives was passed away from their native country, and wherever they went they were met by the rites of a frankly polytheistic religion. In every foreign sanctuary they saw presentments of the chief gods of their own pantheon, but saw them beautified and enlarged. In every country at which

[1] In the Sardinian inscription to which we here allude he is called "the Baal-Samaïm of the isle of Hawks." *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, part i., No. 139.

they touched the same spectacle met their eyes, and the impressions they received were not of a nature to divert their faith from its ancient channels.

This is the true explanation of a phenomenon which at first appears so surprising. The Phœnicians seem never to have suspected that a great religious revolution was taking place in that neighbouring country of Judæa from which they were separated neither by any great social differences nor by any natural barrier. Enterprising traders as they were, they kept themselves *au courant* with the inventions and progress of the world with which they traded. Nothing new could appear in any market known to them without their at once taking measures to supply it to all their clients, near or distant. But what profit could they expect from spreading the worship of a God like the God of Israel; of a God who refused all association or rivalry; of a God who forbade sculpture to give Him a visible personality, and in His hatred of idolatry even went so far as to proscribe the representation of human or animal forms?[1]

Greece would never have obeyed such a command. Her love of fine forms was too great. When Christian societies accepted a religion that was the child of Judaism, they, too, were driven by their natural preferences to find some means of eluding these proscriptions. As for the Phœnicians, they were not like the Greeks, they were not tormented by any inborn desire to reproduce the beautiful; but regard for what seemed their own interests was enough to make them turn their backs on a creed to which such inconvenient conditions were attached. For centuries images were among their principle articles of commerce. Upon the objects of glass and ivory, of metal and terra-cotta, which they sewed broadcast over the Mediterranean basin, the figures of men and of real or fictitious animals abounded. They manufactured gods for exportation upon every island of the Ægæan, and upon all its coasts statues have been found of their great goddess Astarte (Fig. 20), of Bes,[2] a god borrowed perhaps from the Egyptians (Fig. 21), and of those dwarf gods in whom we see the originals of the Greek pygmies (Fig. 22).

[1] *Exodus* xv. 3-5.

[2] HEUZEY, *Sur quelques Représentations du Dieu grotesque appelé Bés par les Égyptiens* (in the *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1879, pp. 140-147).

The scattered mode of life in which the Phœnicians persevered helped to make them indifferent to the higher faith of their immediate neighbours. Cities in which the municipal life is intense will not allow themselves to be absorbed in the unity of a vast and powerful State; they resist what to them seems a degradation, and thus we often find that small countries, in which the feeling of patriotism is strong, are a hindrance to the formation of great States. The same remark applies to the growth of religious conceptions. Among a people with whom

FIG. 20.—Astarte. From a Phœnician terra-cotta in the Louvre.

FIG 21.—Bes. From a Phœnician terra-cotta in the Louvre. Height 8 inches.

these jealous political habits have prevailed, each city has its own god or gods, and a combination of many exceptional circumstances is required before they can break their narrow moulds and enter upon a course of evolution by which they may, in time, become fused into a national god, and finally into a god of humanity.

The Greeks, indeed, succeeded in rising to a spiritual unity unknown to the Phœnicians. With them too the notion of a State was confounded with that of a city, but the lofty intellectual gifts of their race led them at a very early date to endow their gods with powers far above those of mere protecting divinities of a

city or tribe. Greece had great poets, a Hesiod, and above all a Homer, whose words every Greek knew by heart; she had great festivals, such as those of Delphi and Olympia, where all the natives of Hellas could meet as brothers for at least a few days; she had an art which, in its desire for a universal audience, gave fixed types to each of the dwellers on Olympus. Phœnicia was not so fortunate. The efforts she made to counteract the separating influence of her modes of life, and of the configuration of her soil, were slight, and consequently we find the particular municipal character much more strongly marked in her divinities than in the gods of Greece. All this must have had a great effect

FIG. 22.—Pygmy. From a Phœnician terra-cotta in the Louvre. Height 9⅛ inches.

in retarding the development of the religious idea, and of the plastic arts.

Among certain races, of which the Greeks were one, plurality of gods has been a direct result of the infinite variety of divine attributes imagined by the national intellect. The Hellenic polytheism implies a profound analysis of the qualities of man and of the laws of life; it embodies the theology of a people who were in later days to give birth to philosophy. The secondary deities of Phœnicia represent no such systematic effort of the intellect; they correspond mainly to geographical and political divisions.

In the Phœnician texts, in Phœnician proper names, and in the historical books of the Old Testament, the divine name which crops up oftenest is that of Baal. Baal means *the master;* a title of honour which seems to have been applied to all divinities; hence the term in the Bible, *Baalim*, or *Baals*. There were as many Baals, that is to say, masters, as cities or places devoted to the rites of any particular worship. The Baal adored at Tyre, at Sidon, on Lebanon, on Peor, became *Baal-Tsour*, *Baal-Sidon*, *Baal-Lebanon*, *Baal-Peor*. But even behind these local distinctions, a confused notion of primordial unity may be traced, as in the terms *Astoret-sem-Baal*, or *Astarte*, *name of Baal*, in Phœnicia, and *Tanit-Pene-Baal*, or *Tanit*, *face of Baal*, at Carthage. In these formulæ and a few others the term Baal is put, by a kind of abbreviation, as the proper name of the supreme deity, but it never quite lost its wider and more general sense, which was completed by the apposition of the name of a town or mountain. Thus we find that Melkart, the great god of Tyre, whose name and fame were carried so far by the Tyrian colonists, was neither more nor less than the Baal of the Metropolis. "To the Lord Melkart, *Baal of Tyre*," runs a dedication found at Malta.[2]

In this name Melkart, handed down to us by the Greeks, is included another of those epithets with which the Phœnicians loved to honour their gods, namely, the word *Moloch*, or *Melek*, "the king."[3] As an isolated divine title this word has never yet been encountered, but it is often found in composition in proper names of people, and its importance is proved by its use in the title borne by the chief god of Tyre, that Melkart whom the Greeks called "the sea-god Melikertes." Melkart is a contraction of *Melek*-kart, "the God of the City." His complete name was *Baal-Melkart*, or *Melkart-Baal-Tsour*, "Melkart, master of Tyre." The word Adôn, "the lord," was employed in the same fashion. It was only at a comparatively recent date that it became the

[1] PH. BERGER, *La Phénicie*, p. 19; FR. LENORMANT, *Manuel d'Histoire ancienne*, vol. iii. p. 127; DE VOGÜÉ, *Mémoires sur les Inscriptions phéniciennes de l'Isle de Cypre*, 2nd part (*Considérations mythologiques*, in the *Mélanges d'Archéologie Orientale*, 8vo. Paris, 1878).

[2] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, 122 and 122 (*bis*).

[3] As only the consonants are noted in the Phœnician writing, we can only guess at the pronunciation of the name.

proper name of a god, worshipped especially at Gebal, whose cult was afterwards carried as far as Greece, and finally became one of the most famous in the antique world.

From all this it follows that the titles given by the Phœnicians to the more august of their gods were determined chiefly by geographical limitations, and that they must have been far from awaking such clearly defined ideas as those attached by the Greeks to their Zeus, to their Poseidon or Hades, to their Hermes or Apollo. For the same reason they lent themselves much less kindly to plastic figuration, and the critic who attempts to define in words the conceptions embodied in the terms Baal, Melek, Adôn, has no easy task.[1] The examination of certain rites and epithets allows us to catch a glimpse of a nature-god, worshipped chiefly in the most striking of his manifestations, namely, as a sun-god. All the Baalim seem to have had that character, but he in whom it was most strongly marked was the Baal of Gebal, that Tammouz who was invoked by cries of *Adoni, Adoni*, "My lord, my lord."[2] This famous being, who was afterwards to become the simple Syrian hunter of the Greeks, was for the Phœnicians the great sun-god himself, the star that appeared to languish every year with the frosts of winter and to revive every spring; and those seasons of alternate joy and sorrow had their counterpart in the rites with which Adôn was worshipped.

As in Egypt and Chaldæa, the spectacle of an organic world in which all life sprang from the union of the sexes suggested the application of the same condition to the divine world. Every god had a goddess; by the side of each *Baal*, or "master," there was a *Baalat*, or "mistress." At Gebal this mistress was adored under the name of *Baalat-Gebal*, or the "Mistress of Gebal." She is represented on the upper part of the stele of Jehawmelek (Fig. 23). Her reputation was great over the whole coast, and has come down to us through the Greeks as that of Beltis. At Carthage Tanit shared the throne of Baal-Hammon; at Tyre and Sidon Astoret was the Baalat of Baal-Melkart and Baal-Sidon.

Astoret, or, to use a form to which we are better accustomed, Astarte, seems to have had a more real personality than any other Phœnician goddess. Her pre-eminence in that respect was due

[1] M. BERGER mentions another title of the same kind, *El*, which is found associated with the names both of gods and goddesses.

[2] Hence, in all probability, the Greek form *Adonis*. BERGER, *La Phénicie*, p. 20.

to the fact that she had already a long life behind her when she first came to establish herself on the Syrian coasts. She was the Istar of Mesopotamia, with the same name, slightly modified, and the same attributes. The *double* of a male god, Astarte was identified with the moon, the pale reflection of the sun.[1] She was also the goddess of the planet Venus. The Jewish prophets must have had her in their minds when they spoke of the "Queen of Heaven"[2] (*Meleket-has-samaïm*), who must have formed a pair with (*Baal-samaïm*), or "King of Heaven," and been worshipped with him.

FIG. 23.—Upper part of the stele of Jehawmelek. In M. L. de Clercq's collection.

Astarte was, as it were, nature herself; she was the true sovereign of the world, presiding over a never-ending process of creation and destruction, destruction and creation. By war, by disease and plagues of every kind, she thinned out the useless and aged; she removed those who had played their parts and finished

[1] "Astarte, in my belief, is the moon," says the intelligent and well instructed author of the treatise *Upon the Syrian Goddess*, which has been handed down to us among the works of Lucian (§ 4).

[2] JEREMIAH vii. 18; xliv. 17, 18, 19, 25.

their work, while in presiding over love and generation she insured the perpetual renovation of life on earth.[1] To take part under her auspices in the work of nourishing that flame of sexual desire upon which the duration of the species depended, was to perform a meritorious act, and one of worship to the goddess; hence the sacred prostitutions and the habit of attaching to the temples of Astarte those bands of hieroduli, who, under other names, continued the traditions of the Phœnician sanctuaries in Greece. Cyprus, Cythera, Eryx in Sicily, borrowed the worship of the Syro-Phœnician nature-goddess from the Sidonians."[2] First Græcicised under the name of Aphrodite, she also appears in the classic writers as Cypris, Cytheræa, and Erycina, titles which are so many certificates of origin.[3]

The dove, the most prolific of birds, was the favourite sacrifice to Astarte, and afterwards to Aphrodite. In Phœnicia, in Cyprus, in Sardinia, small terra-cotta figures have been found which represent either the goddess herself, or one of her priestesses. They are shown pressing a dove to their bosoms with one hand (Fig. 20).

As a natural effect of a system that ordered the celestial on the same lines as the terrestrial world, these divine couples were

[1] This double character of the great Oriental goddess is well expressed by Plautus, in a few lines put by him into the mouth of an Athenian:

"Diva Astarte, hominum deorumque vis, vita, salus: rursus eadem quæ est
Pernicies, mors, interitus. Mare, tellus cœlum, sidera
Jovis quæcunque templa colimus, ejus ducuntur nutu, illi obtemperant
Eam spectant. . . . . ."—*Mercator*, iv., sc. vi., v. 825.

The origin of the passage must be sought for in Philemon. Towards the end of the fourth century these Oriental religions were well understood in Athens; the Phœnicians had temples of Melkart and Astarte at the Piræus.

[2] In the first century B.C. the temple of Venus Erycina still possessed such tracts of land and troops of slaves of both sexes who, after having served the goddess, became her freedmen and freedwomen and lived under her protection. They formed a class with special rights, which were respected by the Roman governors; they were called in Latin *venerii* (CICERO, *In Q. Cæcilium divinatio*, § 55, 56; *Pro Cluentio* § 43). A Phœnician inscription found at Eryx, related, in all probability, to an offering or donation made to this goddess; but the stone has been lost, and it is impossible to re-establish the text from the bad copy by which alone it is now represented (*Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, part i. No. 135).

[3] The ancients were fully alive to this identity of Astarte and Aphrodite; it will here suffice to quote the testimony of PHILO of Byblos: τὴν Ἀστάρτην Φοίνικες τὴν Ἀφροδίτην εἶναι λέγουσι (*Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, ed. C. MULLER, vol. iii. p. 569). See also MOVERS, *Die Phœnizier*, i. p. 606, where many analogous passages are cited.

completed by the birth of a son, who is often made the lover of his mother. Like Egypt and Chaldæa, Phœnicia had its triads, but they appear to have been less clearly fixed and defined than in the valleys of the Nile and the Euphrates. It would seem that at Sidon there was a bond of this nature between Baal-Sidon, Astarte, and Esmoun,[1] a god whom the Greeks in later days assimilated to their own Æsculapius. The female element in these triads was nearly always embodied in Astarte, at least, among the oriental Phœnicians. As a rule her name was preceded by the honorific title *Rabbat*, "the Great Lady," which was, moreover, applied sometimes to other goddesses.[2] Anat, or Anahit, the Anaïtis of the Greeks, was another name for the same deity; under this title also she was worshipped in Syria, whence her cult passed into Egypt. We know from a Phœnician inscription that she was domiciled in Cyprus.[3] The name changed with the place, but the conception remained.

Beside these great gods Phœnicia had several minor divinities, with whom we are as yet very imperfectly acquainted. *Reshep*, *Resef*, or *Resef-Mikal*, was the Phœnician Apollo. At least a bi-lingual cypriot inscription identifies him, in its Greek part, with the Amyclean Apollo.[4] Resef penetrated into Egypt, and judging from the way he was figured there we should be tempted to see in him a god of war, an Ares or Mars (Fig. 24). Other deities, *Semes*, or "the sun," *Sakon*, and *Poumai*, the pygmy god of the Greeks, have been revealed to us by the proper names of men. It is among such gods as these and others of the same class that we must, no doubt, look for the seven *Cabeiri*, or "powerful ones," whose worship was imported by the Sidonians into Thrace, there to endure until the very last days of paganism. The *Cabeiri* were planetary gods, as their number alone is enough to show. Esmoun—"the eighth," if we may accept the semitic origin of his name—was their chief. He was the third person of the triad which we encounter, under different names, in every Phœnician city. Esmoun was, in fact, the supreme manifestation of the divinity,

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, vol. i. part i. No. 3.

[2] BERGER, *La Phénicie*, p. 22.

[3] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, part i. No. 95. It is in speaking of this inscription that M. DE VOGÜÉ has presented us with those keen remarks on the Phœnician religion that we quote so often in these chapters.

[4] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, part i. No. 89.

summing up in his own person all other manifestations of the creative force, just as the universe incloses the seven planetary heavens.[1]

The whole of this group of gods is characterized by one distinctive feature. They were all dwarf, or child, gods, two things which both from the mythological and iconographical points of view came to much the same thing. Herodotus remarks upon their strange disproportions (Figs. 21 and 22); they

FIG. 24.—Resef. From Wilkinson

reminded him of one of the forms given by the Egyptians to their Ptah, or, as he called him, to their Hephæstus.[2]

The Phœnicians passed so much of their time away from home that they could not fail to adopt many notions from foreign religions. We do not allude to their fundamental beliefs; those seem to have been brought with them from their original home on the Persian Gulf; between Bel and Baal, between Istar and

[1] BERGER, *La Phénicie*, p. 24.

[2] HERODOTUS, iii. 37. Ptah has long been recognised as identical with the Ἐφαίστος of Herodotus.

Astarte, there are similarities upon which it is needless to insist. As our knowledge of the Chaldæan religion increases, we shall perhaps come upon still more striking evidence of the parental relation in which it stood to that of Phœnicia; we may, perhaps, be enabled to trace a descent which is for the present only a very great probability. Like the other tribes by whom the Syrian coast has been peopled, the Phœnicians arrived there with all the elements of a religion whose cradle must be sought about the lower waters of the Euphrates, but in the course of the cosmopolitan existence they led for so long they never ceased to borrow deities and forms of worship from the nations with whom they had dealings, and from those under whose sceptre their country successively passed. The influence of the great empires on the Tigris and Euphrates may be traced in many things. In an inscription at Athens a Phœnician calls himself "Priest of Nergal."[1] A bi-lingual inscription found at Larnaca of Lapethus, in the island of Cyprus, contains a dedication to the goddess Anat, whose name is rendered in the Greek part by Athene.[2] But a far greater influence was exercised by Egypt, with whom Phœnicia had such long and intimate relations. Osiris, Horus, Bast, Harpocrates, all had their worshippers in the coast cities. And their status was not that of foreign gods to which a few individuals turned in temporary and dilettante fashion. This is proved by the place their titles occupy in Phœnician proper names, and by the parallelism established between them and purely Phœnician gods. As the Phœnicians said *Melek-Baal*, so they said *Melek-Osir*. Osiris certainly had his place in the pantheon, although his admission must have taken place at a comparatively late period, and as a consequence of the confidential intercourse between the two countries, that lasted from the days of the Theban Pharaohs to those of the Ptolemies.

Carthage came so late upon the scene, and her relations with her mother city were so intimate, that her religious beliefs cannot have sensibly differed from those of her eastern cousins. Her chief divine couple, the *Baalim* in whose protection the city mainly trusted, were *Baal-Hammon* and *Tanit; Esmoun* completed the

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, part i. No. 119.
[2] *Ibid.* No. 95.

triad. *Baal-Hammon* means "the burning Baal";[1] he was, as his name suggests, a fire or sun god.[2] Baal-Hammon was figured as a man in the prime of life with rams' horns; the arms of his throne were also carved in the shape of rams (Fig. 25). As for Tanit she was a Carthaginian Astarte; she was the great Syrian nature goddess, but with her siderial and lunar character rather more strongly marked.[3] The Greeks identified her with Artemis and

FIG. 25.—Baal-Hammon. Terra cotta. In the Barre collection.

the Romans with Juno; sometimes classic authors call her "the

[1] This follows, at least, from the most probable etymology of the word. Others have been proposed, but have failed to meet with general approval.

[2] Upon the type of Baal-Hammon, upon the rites with which he was worshipped at Carthage, and upon his association with Tanit, see M. BERGER'S *Mémoire sur un Bandeau trouvé dans les Environs de Batna et conservé au Musée de Constantine* (*Gazette archéologique*, 1879, p. 133).

[3] A connection between the names Anat and Tanit may be devined rather than proved; the intervening links are missing. But the conception is the same, and the two words are so much alike that they must have had a common origin. Our readers will remember that in the myth used by Virgil for his story of Dido, the queen's sister is named Anna.

celestial virgin" or "the genius of Carthage."[1] Melkart, in whom the Greeks saw a form of their Heracles, also had a temple, close to the harbour, in all the Phœnician colonies.[2]

Besides these great gods there were, at Carthage, others of less importance, of whom we know little more than the names: *Sakôn*, *Aris*, *Tsaphôn*, males, *Illat* and *Astoret*, females, and others who are alluded to in the texts by such phrases as "the great mother," "the mistress of the sanctuary."

During the two centuries which preceded the fall of Carthage, her religion became stongly tinged with Hellenic elements,[3] but down to the very end certain rites held their own, which by their cruelty bear witness to the hardness of the Phœnician character. With the Carthaginians, as with all other races of antiquity, the sacrifice was the chief act of worship; it was the rite which brought man nearest to his god and gave him the strongest claim upon the protection of heaven. We can easily understand how savage nations thought they could not do honour to their ferocious deities better than by sacrificing members of their own race; but as manners softened under the influence of civilization, the idea of a substitute won gradual but universal acceptance. The substitution was effected in many different ways. "Sometimes a domestic animal, a ram, an ox, a bird, or a stag, was immolated in place of the being to be spared; sometimes the substitute was a stone, which was erected in honour of the god and became a kind of metaphorical sacrifice."[4]

Neither in Egypt nor in Chaldæa have we yet found any trace of human sacrifices, while the Greeks abandoned the custom at a very early date. But among the Phœnicians, and especially the Phœnicians of Africa, these holocausts lasted as long as the gods in whose honour they had first been instituted. They were celebrated at Carthage at a time when human sacrifices roused no

[1] Upon the *Virgo Celestis* of classic writers, of coins and inscriptions, see ECKHEL, *Doct. num. vet.*, vol. vii. p. 183. In the text of the treaty between Philip and Hannibal, which has been handed down to us by POLYBIUS (vii. ix. 2), it must be Tanit who is disguised under the name Καραχηδονίων δαίμων, in a triad where that deity is followed by Heracles (Melkart) and Iolaos (Esmoun).

[2] BERGER, *La Phénicie*, p. 22. FR. LENORMANT, *Manuel d'Histoire ancienne*, vol. iii. p. 227.

[3] DIODORUS, xiv. xxvii. 5.

[4] PH. BERGER, *La Phénicie*, p. 26.

feeling but disgust and horror in the rest of the civilized world.[1] The Phœnicians had been hardened to the practice by long tradition. Its commonest form was the sacrifice of first-born children, or more generally, of newly-born infants. It was a way of devoting first-fruits to heaven. At one time this custom was imported from Phœnicia into Judæa. The Bible speaks of children burnt in the fire, and passing through the fire in honour of Moloch,[2] that is of the solar or fire element worshipped by the Phœnicians under several different names.[3] The fervour with which they entered upon these holocausts was partly caused too by the idea that fire purifies all it touches, that it takes away every stain. It was by such complex sentiments as these that the Carthaginians were led to turn to these horrible sacrifices whenever they found themselves in a critical situation ; their fanaticism then blazed up afresh, and from the open palms of the gigantic statue of Baal-Hammon children of the noblest families rolled into the flames that played about its feet.

The originality of the Phœnician religion lay chiefly in the violence of its rites and in the contrasts they presented. The voluptuous scenes which were being enacted hourly within the precincts of Astarte were immediately followed by paroxysms of barbarous devotion and by the murderous rites they provoked.[4] How much more truculent and passionate all this proves the Phœnicians to have been than such a people as the Egyptians, to say nothing of the Greeks. They were, in fact, merchants and sailors. There was no room in their lives either for literary and philosophic culture, or for those æsthetic pleasures which soften

[1] PHILO speaks of human sacrifices as a rite peculiar to the Phœnician race (*Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, vol. iii. p. 570) ; but it would seem that, acting under Greek influence, the Syrians abandoned them at an early hour. There is nothing to suggest that the Tyrians had recourse to them during the terrible siege by Alexander, when the religious sentiment of the people must have been excited to its highest pitch.

[2] II. KINGS xvii. 31 ; xxi. 6.

[3] According to TERTULLIAN these sacrifices were still openly persevered in as late as the first century of our era (*Apologia*, cap. ix.). Their open celebration ceased only when the Roman Emperors, beginning with Tiberius, decreed the penalty of death against any priest who should be accessory to them.

[4] DIODORUS, xx. xiv. 5-6. JUSTIN, xviii. 6 ; PLUTARCH, *De Superstitione*, xiii. We could quote numerous passages to show with what energy the conscience of the civilized world protested against these holocausts. We are told (JUSTIN, xix. 1) that Darius and Gelo wished to compel the Carthaginians by treaty to renounce human sacrifices (PLUTARCH, *De sera Numinis Vindicta*, 6.

the heart and elevate the mind. Torn on the one hand by their sensual desires and on the other by greed of gain, hardened by conflict with the sea and softened by the pleasures that awaited them ashore, the Phœnicians swung from one extreme to another. When their ventures were turning out badly, when their fleets were threatened by storms or their armies pressed by the enemy, they turned in despair to their gods and made those impious vows which they carried out only too well. A people of traders and harsh to their own debtors, they believed their gods to be as exacting and pitiless as themselves; hence the terrors which led them to sacrifice so many young and innocent lives.

Under the impulse of sentiments which are to be explained by the national habits, the Syrians and Carthaginians had, then, given a peculiar character to their religion; but they had not created the gods whom they adored, and when they wished to give them visible bodies they were quite unable to invent for themselves. They borrowed the types and names of their gods from without, and especially from Chaldæa. Baal is much the same as Bel, and Tammouz is but little removed from the Dommouzi of the Assyrian texts;[1] Astarte and Tanit do not greatly differ from Istar and Anahit, while Baal-Hammon is neither more nor less than the great Libyan god, the supreme deity of Egypt.[2]

Although the Phœnicians imported most of their gods from Mesopotamia, they gave them Egyptian disguises. The Phœnician civilization had its first development during the period of Theban supremacy, and it borrowed types for its deities from the gods of its Egyptian masters. The "great Lady of Gebal," on the stele of Jehawmelek (Fig. 23), is very like an Isis-Hathor, and here (Fig. 26) is a bronze, less ancient no doubt, which also comes from Syria: its workmanship is not quite that of Egypt; there is reason, in fact, to believe that it was cast in Syria. It can be meant for none but Astarte; the disk and horns of the moon seem decisive on that point; but the forehead is surmounted by an asp, like the

[1] FR. LENORMANT, *Sovra il mito d'Adone Tamuz* (extracted from the proceedings of the Congress of Orientalists, held at Florence in 1878).

[2] The influence exercised by the rites and beliefs of Egypt over those of Phœnicia did not escape the ancients. The pseudo-Lucian (*Upon the Syrian Goddess*, § 5) declares its existence in so many words. According to Silius Italicus, a mediocre poet, but a fairly well-informed savant, the rites celebrated in the temple of Gades were Egyptian (iii. v. 20 *et seq*).

brow of Isis. So, too, the Phœnicians adapted the form of the child Ptah to their Cabeiri and Pygmies (Fig. 27).

It was perhaps a sense of their shortcomings as plastic artists that prevented the Phœnicians from placing statues of their great

FIG. 26.—From a bronze in M. Péretié's collection. Height, 16¾ inches.

gods in their principal temples. It seems certain, from the often quoted text of Herodotus,[1] that the temple of Baal-Melkart, at Tyre, inclosed no statute of the god; he was represented only by

[1] HERODOTUS, ii. 44.

two columns, the one of gold, the other of emerald, or perhaps of green glass, in which we must recognize betylæ of an especially sumptuous kind. These columns are figured on the two Maltese pedestals consecrated to Melkart towards the beginning of the second century B.C., by Abdosir and Osirsamar (Fig. 28).[1] Even in the temple of Tanit at Carthage, whose august character is

FIG. 27.—Child god. From a Cypriot terra-cotta in the Louvre. Actual size.

attested by the thousands of votive steles set up in its precincts we doubt whether there was any statue of the goddess ; and our doubts are confirmed when we remember how rudely she is figured on most of the steles set up in her honour. These figures are nothing more than naïve renderings of a conical stone, sometimes

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, part i. No. 122 and 122 *bis*.

with suggestions of a head and arms (Fig. 29), sometimes with lunar symbols (Fig. 30) added to it.

The highest aim the artist can put before himself is to endow the divinity with features that shall correspond to an ideal conception of his majesty. Where no such effort is demanded of him he may acquire great skill of hand and eye, but he will never reach a high degree of nobility and beauty. The relic from Malta, which we reproduce in Fig. 28, allows us to draw the horoscope of Phœnician sculpture. Two Greeks in a similar case would have commissioned an image of Hercules in marble or bronze, but these Phœnicians, who wished to do honour to their



Figs. 29 and 30.—From a Carthaginian votive stele.

god, were content with such a shaft as the first workman at hand could make.

But although the worship of betylæ was not likely to favour the progress of the plastic arts, we find in another part of the Phœnician character a propensity which must have had useful effects. Pupils as they were of Egypt, they never borrowed those composite deities of hers with the heads of hawks, ibises, cats, crocodiles, and hippopotamuses; they only adopted such divine types as were taken from humanity. How this reserve is to be explained we cannot tell, but the fact is certain. Whenever the Phœnicians had to provide a head or a complete body for any one of their gods, they were as frankly anthropomorphic as the Greeks

FIG. 28.—Votive stele. From Malta. In the Louvre. Height 42 inches.

themselves. The consequences, to which we shall have to draw attention hereafter, may be guessed. When the Phœnicians began to provide the still barbarous Greeks with those models which the latter at once hastened to imitate, they did not put into their hands any of those strange and graceless combinations of human and animal forms of which the dwellers in the Nile valley were so fond; in the idols they exported no features but those of men and women were to be found; their execution was awkward and rough, but it had at least the advantage of pointing to the right way, to the only path by which a great art could be reached. Even the brutality with which Syrian art insisted sometimes upon the distinctive features of the sexes had its uses. It excited the curiosity of those who attempted to copy the Phœnician images, and awoke in them the desire to make a close and patient study of the human frame, the most delicate and complex of organic bodies. Thus were they led to understand the difference between the two plans on which Nature has built every living thing, a difference which shrinks almost to effacement in those animals with which the religious iconography of Egypt was content. As often happens when the pupil is both more intelligent than his master and placed in more favourable conditions, the Greeks learnt many things from the Phœnicians that the latter did not know at all or knew but ill. So that, in the statuettes of stone or clay which the Phœnician merchants scattered broadcast over the whole Mediterranean basin, we must recognize the elder sisters, or rather the grand-parents, of those marvellous statues, of those noble and smiling goddesses, before whom the Greeks bent in worship, and before whose fragments we moderns bow in worship too.

§ 4.—*The Phœnician Writing.*

In this history of art we have been compelled to reserve an important place for the written character of Egypt and Chaldæa. In the older Mesopotamian monuments the cuneiform characters are such that we can easily carry our thoughts to the time when they were nothing less than pictures; while the Egyptian hieroglyphs preserved that character to the end of their days. Some peculiarities of treatment in Egyptian sculpture are even to be

accounted for, as we have elsewhere explained,[1] by habits contracted in the carving of hieroglyphs upon stone, wood, and other materials.

There is nothing of the kind in Phœnicia. There we find no trace of a time when thoughts were expressed in ideographic characters. The Phœnicians learnt to write when they invented the alphabet. No one believes that they created it "all standing," but it is still doubtful whether they took their materials from the wedges or from the writing of Egypt.[2] Most scholars who have recently studied the question believe with M. de Rougé, that the borrowing was made from Egypt, and that it was made at a time when a people related to the Phœnicians, the Hyksos of Manetho, ruled in the valley, or at least in the delta, of the Nile.[3] No doubt, however, attaches to the right of the Phœnicians to the honour of having made the decisive step which has given us the alphabet; the opinion of antiquity on the matter is summed up in two famous lines of Lucan:—

> "Phœnices primi, famæ si creditur, ausi
> Mansuram rudibus vocem signare figuris." [4]

---

[1] *Art in Ancient Egypt*, Vol. II. pp. 315, 316.

[2] M. DECKE has lately returned to the Assyrian cuneiform characters for the originals of the alphabetical signs of Phœnicia (*Der Ursprung des altsemitischen Alphabets aus der Assyrischen Keilschrift*, in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenlændischen Gesellschaft*, 1877, pp. 102-154). As M. PH. BERGER has remarked, the theory of M. Decke (which has, however, found few supporters) has authority on its side which the learned German has failed to invoke, namely, that of PLINY. "So far as I am concerned," says the latter, "I persist in believing the alphabet to be of Assyrian origin. Literas semper arbitros Assyrias fuisse." He adds, however, "Sed alii apud Ægyptios a Mercurio, ut Gellius, alii apud Syros repertas volunt." *Nat. Hist.*, i. 412.

[3] The work of M. DE ROUGÉ, which was read before the Academy as long ago as 1859, was only published in 1874, under the title *Mémoire sur l'Origine égyptienne de l'Alphabet phénicien*. For more complete information on all these difficult questions we must refer our readers to the work of the late M. FR. LENORMANT: *Essai sur la Propagation de l'Alphabet phénicien dans l'ancien Monde;* the first volume only has been published (1 vol. 8vo., Maisonneuve, 1872). M. PH. BERGER'S article in the *Encyclopédie des Sciences religieuses* (*L'Écriture et les Inscriptions sémitiques*) may also be profitably consulted. It is later in date (1880), and its author has been able to make use of the information collected in preparing the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*. Finally, we may point to the article *Alphabet* (FR. LENORMANT) in the *Dictionnaire des Antiquités grecques et romaines*.

[4] LUCAN, *Pharsalia*, iii. v. 220-222. So, too, PLINY: "Ipsa gens Phœnicum in magna gloria est litterarum inventionis" (*Nat. Hist.* v. xii. 13); DIODORUS SICULUS: Σύροι εὑρεταὶ τῶν γραμμάτων εἰσι (v. 74).

"Here the evidence of writers is fully confirmed by the discoveries of modern science. We know no alphabet, properly speaking, which is earlier than that of the Phœnicians, and every alphabet that has survived to our own day, or of which we have any fragments, grows more or less directly out of the first alphabet elaborated by the sons of Canaan and spread by them over the whole surface of the ancient world."[1]

Whether the Phœnician letters were derived, as M. de Rougé believes, from the cursive writing employed on the papyri of the first Theban empire, or whether, as some have lately contended, they were taken directly, or at least in their chief elements, from a few phonetic symbols occurring in the monumental character,[2] it now appears certain that the invention dates from a much earlier period than was formerly supposed. The oldest known alphabetical inscription is that of Mesa, King of Moab, which dates from the year 896 B.C., and it already contains evidence of great fluency and of very long habit in the use of a written character.[3] In such a matter we can hardly suggest a date, but it seems very probable that the Phœnicians were already in possession of their alphabet when they first began to navigate the Levant.[4] In any case the invention was known to the first Sidonian sailors who landed on the coasts of Greece and her islands. Thenceforward, on every shore frequented by the Syrian ships, the savage ancestors of the Greeks might group themselves about the stranger merchants, and with growing curiosity watch them as they recorded the results of each day's trade. The little writing-case (Fig. 31) which they drew from some fold of their robes, the slender *kalem*, dipped in ink, which moved so rapidly over clay tablet or papyrus strip, the small, crowded, queer-shaped marks which were continually repeated, but ever in some new combination, must all, for some time, have seemed parts of some magic and therefore disquieting rite. We cannot say how many years or centuries were required to carry the power and purpose of those mysterious figures into their minds, but we may be sure that as soon as a full comprehension dawned upon them they became eager to apply them to their own language.

[1] FR. LENORMANT, *Essai sur la Propagation de l'Alphabet phénicien*, vol. i. p. 84

[2] This is the opinion of M. HALÉVY (*Mélanges d'Épigraphie sémitique*, p. 168).

[3] PH. BERGER, *L'Écriture et les Inscriptions sémitiques*, p. 15.

[4] FR. LENORMANT, *Essai*, vol. i. pp. 95 and 101.

FIG. 31.—Egyptian writing-case.

How were the Phœnicians themselves led to embark on the path which ended in their alphabet? They borrowed her arts and industries from Egypt, why did they not borrow her writing also? It was no doubt because they found it too inconvenient, too complex, too difficult to master. The Egyptian writing included ideographic symbols, some of which were taken in their natural, others in a metaphorical, sense. These were combined with phonetic signs representing sometimes syllables, sometimes isolated consonants. The same word or idea might be rendered here by a single ideogram, there by a combination of various figures. This led to confusion, and finally to the embarrassment of the reader and to the possibility on his part of continual mistakes. The people who invented such a system, and persevered in its use for thousands of years, did not suspect its defects. There is no instrument of which long hereditary custom will not make man a complete master. Scribes of the Ptolemaic and Roman times sometimes arranged their symbols as if they were amusing themselves by making the inscriptions with which they covered the temple walls as obscure as they could. Was this because, as some have declared, they did not want to be understood? Not at all; they were merely showing their skill by playing with a difficulty, just as a modern virtuoso plays with a difficult passage on the pianoforte.

Drilled by constant practice from infancy upwards into the use of this delicate machine, the lettered Egyptian might

well have a genuine admiration for it, and speak of it as a present to men from Thoth, the ibis-headed god; but to strangers wishing to master it its merits would be less evident. To them the task would be facilitated neither by native predisposition, nor by the effects of a professional education begun at an age when the freshness and elasticity of the memory allow much to be asked from it. I doubt very much whether any man of foreign race, either Greek or Syrian, ever managed to work his way into the ranks of the Egyptian scribes, or even entertained such a hopeless ambition. And yet to the Syrians who frequented the ports and principal towns of Lower Egypt it must have been very tantalizing to see the king's overseers and the nome princes taking account of frontier dues, of the quantities of grain, and of the heads of cattle and game which were sold in the markets.[1] Such a sight must have roused their envy much more readily than the pompous inscriptions on the pylons and temple walls. Their ambition was not of the grandiose kind. In this world, where other men thought so much of gaining battles, their only wish was to gain money. For their purposes it was all-important that they should master some form of cursive writing. What an advantage it would be to be able to write down day by day, or rather hour by hour, all transactions begun or ended, and every engagement entered into; what a pleasure to have something to trust to beyond memory, and especially beyond the memory of a debtor!

But the cursive writing of Egypt was hardly less difficult for the stranger than the hieroglyphs. Like the latter it included characters of very different values, and before it could be used with any ease, the hieroglyphs themselves, of which it was in fact an abbreviation, had to be learnt. Before a foreigner could manage such a machine it required to be simplified; the multitude of symbols had to be reduced to a comparatively small number; and there was only one way of doing this with any success. In any ideographic system of writing the symbols are no doubt less numerous than the objects and ideas to be symbolized, but the difference is comparatively small, and it is clear that any figurative method requires a very large number of signs. The different vowel-sounds in their union with the various consonants also give rise to a good many combinations, so that a writing founded on the notation of syllables requires a great many characters—there

[1] *Art in Ancient Egypt*, Vol. I. Figs. 19 and 21.

are a hundred or so in the cuneiform syllabary. But it is a different matter if each separate character stands for nothing beyond one of the elementary articulations of the human voice. In no existing alphabet are there more than about twenty letters corresponding to sounds between which the ear will make a real distinction.

Among the phonetic elements of Egyptian writing there were signs of this kind, real letters. The thing to be done was to separate them from the signs of syllables, of objects, and ideas, to take these letters and to leave to the scribes of Memphis those other modes of notation which only served to complicate and encumber their graphic system. How did the necessity for such an operation suggest itself? Was it seen from the beginning that only a portion of the Egyptian signs should be borrowed? Were there long periods of probation, or was the alphabet constituted at once, on the principle which has given it such a prodigious success, by the genius of a single man? This question we shall never be able to answer. The date of the invention of the alphabet, if it had a date, is still more important in the history of civilization than that of the invention of printing. To resolve a word into its primitive elements certainly required a much greater effort of the brain than to invent movable letters and print with them by pressure. We can hardly look without emotion upon the *Forty-two-line Bible*, which was printed at Mayence in 1456, but how much more deeply should we be moved could we have placed before our eyes the first inscription in which a Syrian scribe made use of those twenty-two letters that, by a long series of insensible changes, have taken the forms they bear on this page! Gutenberg has his statues everywhere, the work of sculptors such as Thorwaldsen and David d'Angers. Those honours are well deserved, and yet the Phœnician who presented his country with this marvellous instrument deserved them better; but his name was forgotten even by his countrymen. If we could catch a glimpse into the profound darkness of the past, and recognize the inventor of the alphabet among the innumerable ancestors of our race, should we not lead him from the crowd and place him at the head of the long procession of benefactors to humanity?

One of the chief merits of the Phœnician alphabet lies in what we may call its universal character. The elementary articulations of the human voice are much the same among all peoples. Every

national keyboard lacks, indeed, one or two notes, but the chief difference between one language and another can hardly be expressed in written characters; it lies in the *timbre*, in the intonation, or, if we may use the term, in the colour of the sounds. Nothing is easier than to note, either by means of the Phœnician alphabet, or of others founded upon it, the various articulations that make up a local dialect or language. Any race in whom a sight of this alphabet and of what it could do aroused a desire to write on the same principle themselves could, no doubt, invent an alphabet for their own use; but, in those long ages of gradual progress whose results are summed up for us in the word civilization, the human intellect worked on no such lines. Man understood how to utilize the discoveries of his ancestors, and to make them points of departure for new adventures; he did not waste his time in doing over again what had been done, and well done, already; he set himself rather to revise and perfect.

To this rule the alphabet was no exception. All those peoples who were in communication with Phœnicia by sea or land borrowed her characters and adapted them by a few additions and retouches to the notation of their own idiom. The Phœnicians took the forms and values of their symbols from the cursive writing of Egypt. By slow stages these symbols passed to the Hebrews, to the northern Semites, or Aramæans, to the Libyans through Southern Arabia, and even to the Hindoos; westwards they spread among the Greeks, the Italiots, and even the distant tribes of Spain. We cannot be surprised that in travelling so far their aspect was greatly modified. To these changes many things contributed; different habits of hand, different materials, and different social conditions among those who wrote. It is when we go back to the oldest forms of the Phœnician alphabet itself, and of its direct issue, that we find resemblances so strong that all doubt as to their original identity is dispelled. Compare, for example, the characters in the oldest Greek inscriptions from Thera with those on the stele of Mesa or on the bronze cup inscribed with the name of Hiram (Fig. 32).[1] The student of these early alphabets will soon find, too, that it was not only the shapes of the characters that changed, but also, though in comparatively few cases, their phonetic values.

The Phœnician alphabet had no vowels. The reader was left

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. No. 6, and plate iv.

to fill them in according to the sense of the phrase. Such a want of definition must have been very inconvenient to the Greeks. We know how great a part is played by vowels in their methods of derivation, in their declensions and conjugations. "To provide themselves with vowels the Greeks took the semi-vowels of the Phœnicians, and as even these were not enough, they turned to the gutturals, so numerous in the Phœnician alphabet, and there only used to make the language clear and sonorous; *ioa* and *vav* became I and Y; *aleph* became A, *hé* E, *heth* H, *ain* O. Over *vav* the Greeks seem to have hesitated; they took it up again and again as if they found it difficult to exhaust the possibilities of a letter whose value, as in Hebrew, was somewhat vague and floating. Thus we find that *vav* gave birth successively to the Greek *digamma* and *upsilon*, and in Latin to four letters: F, answering to the *digamma*, U, V, and Y."[1]

FIG. 32.—Fragment of a bronze cup French National Library.

By these observations we are enabled to form a fair judgment of the services rendered to phonetic writing by the Greeks; at the first attempt they solved a problem which had always puzzled the Semites. The latter tried now and then to note the vowel sounds with precision, but during the whole existence of their idiom they never quite succeeded; the system of their primitive alphabet was, in fact, unequal to the task. The vowel-points of the rabbis of the sixth century of our era were applied, in a very artificial way, to a language which was then dead. We have complete proof that those signs give a false idea of the way the words of the Old Testament were pronounced at the time they were first written.[2]

[1] BERGER, *L'Écriture et les Inscriptions sémitiques*, p. 17.
[2] *Ibid.*

The Phœnicians were very far from exhausting the uses of the admirable instrument they had invented. They used it for "keeping their books," but not for expressing their higher thoughts; they had no literature in the true sense of the word. They seem to have written by preference on precious stones, where there was room only for very short texts, and upon bronze, most of which has long ago disappeared. "Before the discovery of Mesa's inscription, one might have doubted whether epigraphy was made use of by any Canaanitish people. Steles like those of Mesa must have been rare, and as for the habit of putting inscriptions on monumental buildings, on tombs, on coins, it cannot have dated back beyond the day when imitation of the Greeks began. It is so with the Phœnician coinage. There is no Phœnician money anterior to the coinage of Greece and Persia. The inscription of Esmounazar is equally modern; and the awkward, laboured way in which it is turned differs widely enough from the firm and simple style of men who have written much upon stone. In place of the grand manner of Greece and Rome, the only considerable inscription that has yet been found in Phœnicia is nothing but the long-winded verbiage of a narrow-souled individual oppressed by terrors as to the fate of his own bones.[1] . . . The very execution of the inscription betrays a little-practised hand. The carver has begun twice over, and the second time he has altered his process. There is, too, something very strange in the monotony of the Carthaginian epigraphy. Of two thousand five hundred known inscriptions from Carthage, all but three or four are practically identical.[2] In short, the inventors of writing do not seem to have written much, and we may at least affirm that the public monuments of Phœnicia were without inscriptions down to the Greek period."[3] Since attention was turned to this question by the action of the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, the number of Phœnician texts has increased with great rapidity; and yet, in the whole of

[1] When M. Renan wrote these lines, in 1874, the stele of Jehawmelek had not been published. There is nothing in it, however, to modify the judgment we have quoted.

[2] We may now be permitted to modify the figures given by M. Renan twenty years ago. When he wrote the page we have quoted, M. de Sainte-Marie had not yet collected and despatched to France those hundreds of steles on all of which homage to "Tanit, face of Baal," is rendered in identical terms.

[3] RENAN, *Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 832, 833.

the vast repertory which we owe to the industry of M. Renan and his colleagues, we cannot cite a single text that may be fairly compared to those inscriptions of Greece and Rome in which the voice of a great and free people makes itself heard across the ages.

And in Phœnicia the form is worthy of the matter. There is nothing in the appearance of the letters to captivate the eye or to induce the mind to seriously weigh the sense. Phœnicia had no special form of letters for monumental use. Her epigraphic alphabet never lost its cursive look (Fig. 33). "In Phœnician inscriptions we find none of those expedients with which the Greeks and



FIG. 33.—Fragment of a sepulchral cippus. From Cyprus.[1]

Latins contrived to give an architectural character to their texts on stone."[2] There is no care for symmetry, no variation in the calibre of letters, no indication of proper names or important words by capital letters. The characters are all the same height, and their angular forms with long tails and variously sloping strokes follow each other in well drilled ranks. The lines are not always straight, and they are limited only by the field on which they are traced. It certainly never dawned upon the mind of a Phœnician scribe that an inscription might have its beauty even for those who

[1] RENAN, *Mission de Phénicie*, p. 834.

[2] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. plate 8.

could not read its words. All he thought about was to cut his texts correctly on the stone. In its writing, as in its colonial system, its art, and its industry, the Phœnician genius thought only of the immediate practical result; it was essentially utilitarian.

§ 5.—*General Remarks upon the Study of Phœnician Art.*

The study of Phœnician art is surrounded by quite peculiar difficulties. When we had to explain the arts of Egypt, Chaldæa, and Assyria, and to form a judgment on their merits, we had only to transport ourselves in imagination to the valleys of the Nile, the Euphrates, and the Tigris; it was enough to explore the ruins of their buildings, and to examine the series of remains of every kind which have been collected into public and private museums. Phœnician art is not to be studied under such conditions as these. Upon its native soil it has left but feeble traces. Its *débris* must be sought for from one end of the Mediterranean to the other. In that great collection of Phœnician texts in which every inscription should at last find a place, there are only nine from the Syrian coast;[1] Athens and the Piræus have given nearly as many, namely seven;[2] Cyprus has furnished eighty-six;[3] Malta and Gozo twelve;[4] and Sardinia twenty-four.[5] Those from Carthage are counted in thousands.

The same observation applies to the remains of Phœnician art; these are nowhere so uncommon as in Syria. M. Renan, who devoted a whole year to the exploration of Phœnicia, insists upon this curious fact and explains it historically.

"The ancient civilization of Phœnicia has been more thoroughly broken up than any other. A reason for this is to be found in the fact that its habitat has always been very thickly peopled. During the Greek, Roman, Byzantine, Crusading, and Mussulman periods, they have never ceased to build, to re-work old stones, to beat the great blocks left from ancient days into smaller units. We may say that, for the last fifteen or sixteen centuries, very few

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. 1-9.
[2] *Ibid.* pars i. 115-121.
[3] *Ibid.* Nos. 10-96.
[4] *Ibid.* Nos. 122-132 (including 122 *bis* and 123 *bis*).
[5] *Ibid.* 139-162.

stones have been cut from any quarry in Syria. The old blocks have been made to serve again and again, until nothing of their original physiognomy is left. The Crusades especially were disastrous in this respect. The Templars, the Hospitallers, the whole of the great feudal bodies of Syria, built gigantic walls for their own defence, and as they were good builders and seldom used a stone without having it first re-worked, the evidences of the early civilization were widely obliterated. Hence the archæological destitution of the coasts of Syria and Cyprus. . . . .

"The situation of Phœnicia has had a great deal to do with the destruction of its antiquities. Buildings near the seaboard run a much greater risk of destruction than those hidden away in the interior, especially in a country like Syria, where there were neither roads nor vehicles, and where anything that was too heavy for a camel had to stay where it was. But on the Phœnician coast a ship could be brought up close to any ancient building and its stones removed with ease. It was thus that the pagan Ephesus (which is distinct from the Christian Ephesus or *Aïa-Solouk*) served as a marble quarry for the builders of Constantinople. The enterprises of Djezzar, of Abdallah Pacha, of the Emir Beschir, and, at an earlier period, those of Fakhreddin, had an analogous effect in Syria. Similar causes have led to the rapid disappearance of Athlith in our own days. . . . .

"In Syria religious reactions were no less fatal to the monuments. Christianity, so tender to antique works in Greece, was a great destroyer in the Lebanon.[1] The natives of the Lebanon, both Mussulman and Christian, are, if I may venture to say so, quite without the sentiment of art; their feelings cannot be reached by plastic beauty; their first impulse at the sight of a statue is to break it. . . . . Finally, the greed of the natives has also been the cause of wide destruction. They have broken up tombs and destroyed inscriptions in their haste to get at the treasures within; every sepulchre that was not hidden has been broken to pieces. . . . . Political anarchy and the absence of all public control have contributed to the same result. . . . . When we reckon up all these conditions, and add to them the zeal of those modern searchers for antique wealth who overrun the whole country, we

[1] See the *Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 220, 287; and M. AMÉDÉE THIERRY'S account of the destructive missions of St. John Chrysostom, in the *Revue des deux Mondes* of 1st January, 1870, pp. 52 *et seq.*

are surprised that a single vestige of the past remains in it. We can hardly understand how it is that a few points on the coast, such as *Oum-el-Awamid* and *Amrit*, still preserve a few fragments that have come down from a very remote antiquity."[1]

Like the philologist and the epigraphist, the historian of art would condemn himself to know very little indeed of the work accomplished by this industrious people if he confined himself to what he could learn within the narrow limits of Phœnicia proper, a country of which we may say in the words of the poet that "its very ruins have perished." The lives of the Phœnicians were passed anywhere but at home. Many of them were born in the colonies, and many no doubt lived and died without visiting their mother city. If we wish to become well acquainted with the people, and to trace out the various directions in which their active intelligence made itself felt, we must imitate them in these particulars; we must take passage on their ships, and disembark on all the shores they so long frequented. We must stay for a time in their company, wherever they rested longest, and where consequently there is the best chance of finding evidence of their action and presence.

Acting on this plan we shall, in the first place, follow them to Cyprus. Cyprus was not Phœnicia. At a very early date Greek colonists landed on the island, and, establishing themselves side by side with the Semites, soon contrived to divide the whole country with them. But the chief maritime city, Kition, preserved its almost exclusively Syrian character down at least to the partition of Alexander's empire; it was situated on the eastern coast of the island, and formed a pendant to Tyre and Sidon. In other parts also, as at Paphos on the southern coast, and in the interior at Idalion and Golgos, Phœnician ideas had taken such deep root that all the progress of the Greeks did not efface their traces. We have already noticed the large number of Phœnician inscriptions found in Cyprus, and, as might be expected, the number of Phœnician objects made either in those Syrian towns with which the island was in such constant communication or in the colony itself, is also very great. At Kition, and in other towns, manufactories existed which were in fact no more than branch houses of

[1] Renan, *Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 816-819. See also pp. 154 and 155 in the same book, where M. Renan gives details of the destruction by the modern vandal of the antiquities of Byblos.

those at Tyre and Sidon. It was the same at Carthage. As her commerce and political importance developed, it became more and more necessary that she herself should be in a position to produce the objects with which she trafficked in the markets of the West; all the industries of the metropolis must in time have been acclimatized within her walls, with their hereditary secrets and their accumulations of motives and models. In most cases we are quite unable to distinguish between a Phœnician vase made in Syria and one turned out from an African workshop.

But Carthage is as bare as the Syrian coast of the works of Phœnician architects and artisans. The real Carthage, the Punic city, was twice destroyed by conquerors, who burnt, dismantled, and demolished as soon as the place had fallen, and the ruins they left were finally removed by the rebuilders of a few generations later. Old materials were used again, and their original features destroyed. The few monuments that may have escaped destruction are now buried under such heaps of *débris* that modern explorers of the site have hardly touched them at any point. It is in Sicily, in Sardinia, and in Italy, that we shall find the products of Carthage, just as we find those of Syria in the islands and on the mainland of Greece. The remains of antiquity are everywhere better preserved in Greece and Italy than in Syria or Africa. Their vast cemeteries have handed down to modern curiosity great collections of sepulchral furniture, in which Phœnician art is largely represented both by works which really belong to it and by the imitations which it provoked.

But it may be asked, How do we recognize this art in the absence of examples found in Syria itself, or at least at Carthage, which might give us types of the style and taste of Phœnicia? To this we answer, in the first place, that such examples are not entirely wanting. Exhausted as it is, the soil of Phœnicia has yielded a certain number of monuments by the careful examination of which we can arrive at certain well defined conclusions. By comparing these one with another, we obtain at least the rough outlines of the formula we seek, and these outlines become clearer in the light of Phœnician history.

Phœnicia was the vassal successively of Egypt and Assyria, and in the objects that left her workshops she must have mingled elements taken from both those great civilizations. Phœnicia alone was in a position, by her geographical situation and the part

she played in the antique world, to produce all those objects, now so numerous and so well known, which are neither frankly Egyptian, nor frankly Assyrian, and yet contain no important elements from any other source. Finally, the Phœnicians now

Fig. 34.—Phœnician wall of Eryx.[1]

and then signed their works. In the ramparts of the great city of Eryx, so famous for its shrine of the Syrian Astarte, the marks of the Carthaginian masons have been found quite lately on the stones of the lower courses (Fig. 34). This is almost always

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. plate 29 (p. 96).

the same letter, a *beth*, usually from five to twelve inches high (Fig. 35).[1]

Our readers will remember the bronze platters which were found at Nineveh; many like them were found at distant points on the Mediterranean, and from the first archæologists have never hesitated to ascribe them to a Phœnician origin. But that which after all was no more than a very probable conjecture was changed into certainty by the famous discovery at Palestrina: upon one of these platters, found in 1876 in the necropolis of the ancient Præneste, in the interior of Latium, a short but very clearly engraved Phœnician inscription was discovered and read;[2] in all likelihood it gives us the name of the first owner of the dish, rather than that of its maker[3] it runs *Esmunjaïr-ben-Asto* (Fig. 36). This point, however, is of slight importance; the value of the discovery lies in the fact that vases, diadems, jewels, etc., were found in the same tomb; that they were made in

FIG. 35.—Carthaginian mason's mark.[4]

the same way and decorated in the same spirit as the platter, and that no reason can be named for giving them a different origin. Here then we have a whole collection of objects, with the

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. No. 136. Beside *beth*, *phe* has been found once and *ain* seven times.

[2] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, p. i. No. 164. At the head of the article devoted to this inscription by the editors of the *Corpus* will be found a list of all the writings to which its discovery has given birth. The original of our reduction (Fig. 36) is plate 32 of vol. x. of the *Monimenti* of the *Institut de Correspondance archéologique*; but aided by a fine photograph, for which we are indebted to the kindness of M. Fiorelli, our draughtsman has endeavoured to give his figures a sharper contour and to mark their relief with more accuracy.

[3] M. RENAN suggests that the name is that of some person deceased, to whose memory the dish was consecrated, and whose person was symbolized by the hawk which occupies the centre. We find it difficult to admit this explanation for an object which was destined, by its very nature, to pass from hand to hand, and, as the place of the discovery proves, to become an object of commerce.

[4] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. plate 29.

label, if we may use the word, of a Phœnician agent attached to them. If we take them one by one, we may surely arrive at an idea of the taste and methods of the Carthaginian worker in precious metal; I say Carthaginian because philologists have marked a peculiarity in the text of this platter which suggests an African rather than a Syrian origin.

Fig. 36.—Phœnician platter; silver. Diameter 7⅞ inches. Drawn by Wallett.

It will be seen, then, that the method we propose to follow is less uncertain than it seems. No doubt we shall take our examples from points very far apart, but that does not mean that we shall take them at hazard. When we refer some object found in a tomb at Mycenæ, in Etruria, or Sardinia to

Phœnician workmen, we do so because its treatment is different from that of any known local workshop, and because the salient features of its decoration harmonize at all points with those with which we have become familiar in our study of monuments drawn from Phœnicia proper and with the few pieces that bear Semitic inscriptions. In order to widen our field of choice we shall bring back to the quays of Tyre and Sidon the objects carried by their commerce to the four corners of the ancient world; but, before admitting a vase or a trinket into our museum, we shall look at every side of it, and reject it unless it bears the undoubted stamp of some industrial centre of the Phœnicians.

The Greek genius soon emancipated itself from the precepts and example of Phœnicia; it created an art far superior to that of its masters, an art of great and commanding originality; but it was otherwise with some of the pupils of Tyre and Sidon. Neither the Cypriots nor the Hebrews succeeded in shaking off the ascendency of the Phœnician types. At Jerusalem, as at Golgos, types were modified to a certain degree, for in the one place the faith of the people was different, in the other their social habits and the materials of which their artists and artisans made use; but in neither country did they examine nature closely enough, in neither were their inventive faculties sufficiently alive, for their art to win a really national and original physiognomy. Cypriot art and Jewish art are no more than varieties, or, as a grammarian would say, dialects, of the art of Phœnicia. We shall therefore include them in the art history of the famous nation on the Syrian coast. We shall also have to devote a short chapter to some structures and bronze figures of a quite peculiar character, which are found only in Sardinia. The fantastic statuettes and other objects which have been met with in the ruins of the Sardinian towers are, no doubt, the products of a local and indigenous art, but that art was only developed on contact with the Phœnicians and while they were masters of the seaboard. As we shall have no occasion to revert to these rude works in the sequel of our history, our examination of them will be given in the form of an appendix to the present volume.

From all that we have said, our readers will perceive that our present task is less easy than either of the two which have preceded it. The art history of Phœnicia has many divisions and subdivisions, and it presents another difficulty: its limits are

hard to define; it is difficult to fix upon a date at which our labours should close. Egyptian art always remained faithful to itself and to its principle. Down to the appearance of the Ptolemies every change was made on the sole basis of its own past; it had never come under foreign influence. Of the art of Chaldæo-Assyria we may say the same. It had produced all the works we have described[1] before the development of the Greek genius had gone far enough to penetrate those distant countries and to impose its own models upon their inhabitants. With Phœnicia, and still more with Cyprus, it was otherwise. The plastic genius of their inhabitants was not very pronounced, and the example of Greece began to have its effect upon them at a very early hour. As they had imitated Egypt, Chaldæa, and Assyria in their order, so they began to imitate Greece as soon as the latter had created her architectural orders and had learnt to give the human form a truth and nobility unknown before her time.

And as generation followed generation, and the art of the Greeks mounted higher and higher, the influence they exercised over the whole Mediterranean basin, with the one exception of Egypt, became more and more decisive. After a certain date Cyprus and Phœnicia hardly fashioned an object in which a knowledge of Hellenic types is not betrayed in some detail of form or ornament. It may be thought that such objects should be left for discussion when we come to treat of the art of Greece, or should be disregarded altogether. But the remains of the primitive and purely Oriental period are too scanty both in Phœnicia and Cyprus; certain methods of production and certain ornamental motives are only known to us through these monuments of the transition. It is of great importance that motives taken from Egypt and Mesopotamia and the local practices of the Syrian workmen should be traced even in things governed as a whole by Greek taste; we have no other means of showing how closely long practice and hereditary predisposition had attached these Oriental artists to methods and types which they continued to employ long after all their surroundings had changed, and after they themselves had begun to prefer Greek to their own national

[1] *History of Art in Ancient Egypt*, 2 vols. 8vo (1883), and *History of Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, 2 vols. 8vo (Chapman and Hall, 1884).

idiom. The question as to how far we should go in this direction and what criterion we should use in deciding that this or that monument deserves a place in a history of Phœnician art is one of tact and appreciation. The great thing is to make sure that every fragment of sculpture or architecture mentioned in these pages is capable of adding to our knowledge.



CHAPTER II.

ON THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF PHŒNICIAN ARCHITECTURE.

§ 1.—*Materials and Construction.*

Phœnicia is a country of mountains. The whole territory is cut up by the Lebanon and by the spurs it throws out westwards to the sea. Consequently there is no lack of stone, but its quality is mediocre. Neither marble nor sandstone are to be found. Near Safita, as in certain cantons of Galilee, a few quarries exist, but their produce has hardly been taken beyond the immediate district. The common material of the country is a rather soft calcareous stone, which crops up through the surface of the soil.

The first idea of the tribes who came to settle in the country must have been to cut the living rock where they found it. Wherever it did not stand above the ground in ridges or isolated masses, it was to be encountered at a very slight depth under the thin stratum of vegetable earth which was deposited in the valleys, at the feet of the cliffs, and on the less abrupt slopes from the hills to the sea. From one end of maritime Syria to the other, tombs were hollowed in the rock down to the last days of antiquity; and such labours were undertaken for the living as well as the dead. In the beginning, perhaps, the settlers took up their abode in natural grottoes, which could be easily enlarged and made more convenient, and even in later days, when their ideas had outgrown those humble dwellings, they continued to profit by the accidents of their rocky territory. Thus "one of the most curious of the remains at Amrit is a monolithic house, cut entirely from a single mass of rock (Fig. 37). The material was cut away in such a fashion that only thin walls and partitions were left adhering to

the soil. The principle façade, which faces westwards, is one hundred feet long. The depth of the house is also about a hundred feet, the height of the walls is about twenty feet and their thickness about thirty-two inches. The interior was divided

FIG. 37.—Rock-cut house at Amrit. From Renan.

into at least three chambers by partitions left in the same way. The external wall to the north was artificial; its lowest courses are still to be found hidden in the soil, the south wall was partly rock, partly masonry."[1] In the island situated to the north of the

FIG. 38.—Rock-cut walls at Saïda. From Renan.

modern town of Saïda the rocky soil still bears traces of similar works. The lower parts of walls are shaped as they stand; we find them pierced in many parts with niches and rectangular or

[1] RENAN, *Mission de Phénicie*, p. 92.

roundheaded doorways; in a few instances even partition walls are rock cut. (Fig. 38).[1]

FIG. 39.—Fragment of the map of Amrit. Fr

We find the same contrivance in a curiously arranged temple, which must have been one of the earliest of the shrines of Marath.



FIG. 40.—The Tabernacle of Amrit. From Renan.

A large quadrangle, 192 feet by 160, has been cut in the living rock (Fig. 39). In the centre has been left a block some twenty feet

[1] RENAN, *Mission de Phénicie*, p. 363. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 62-68, and plates viii. and x.

square and ten high. Upon this cubical mass, which is one with the actual floor of the temple, has been built a small tabernacle which we shall have to examine in detail in our chapter on religious architecture (Fig. 40). A similar mingling of the two processes is to be found in the remains of the formidable ramparts with which the island of Arvad was surrounded. The built part of the wall rests upon a rock-cut plinth some twelve or fourteen feet high (Fig. 7); the same arrangement may be traced in the *débris* of the Phœnician walls at Sidon (Fig. 41). Like the temple court at Marath the ditch is cut in the rock. Another example of this is to be seen at *Semar-Gebeyl*, where a castle built in the middle ages has profited by the gigantic works undertaken for the guarding of an old Giblite fortress against a sudden assault.[1] Finally, at Arvad and many other places we find cisterns, silos and the containers of

FIG. 41.—Remains of the walls of Sidon. From Renan.

wine-presses hollowed in the soft rock, the surface of which was rendered fit for its purpose by a coat of stucco.[2]

We may here quote a text from an old historian which proves that these habits of the Phœnicians excited remark even from their contemporaries: "When the Phœnicians began to settle in great numbers on those rocky shores to which they were attracted by the richness of the purple dye, they built houses for themselves and surrounded them with ditches; as they cut the rock for this latter purpose, they used the material removed for the walls of their towns, and so protected their ports and jetties."[3]

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 244, and plate xxxvii. [2] *Ibid.* p. 40, and plate iii.

[3] CLAUDIUS IOLAUS, quoted by Stephen of Byzantium, *s.v.* Δώρα. This method of extracting the wall, so to speak, from its own ditch, was used at Arvad, at Tortosa, at Anéfé, and at Semar-Gebeyl.

Building proper was only turned to in the last extremity, when there was no rocky site available. But by its very nature rock could only be used for the substructures of buildings; it broke off short at the level of the soil, while its irregular and capricious forms put great difficulties in the way of those who tried to make excessive use of it. The idea of finishing the work by means of cut blocks must soon have occurred to the builders. At first it was a mere question of adding a little here and there to the rock-cut walls, and the larger the applied masses the better were those early



FIG. 42.—Substructure of one of the temples at Baalbek. From Lortet.

constructors pleased with their work. Their point of departure was what has been called *monolithism*,[1] and from it Syrian and Phœnician builders never entirely shook themselves free; traces of it may even be found in the Roman period, in the substructures of the temples at Baalbek (Fig. 42).[2]

[1] RENAN, *Mission de Phénicie*, p. 315.

[2] Our readers will remember the famous *trilithon* of Baalbek, the three stones which crown the platform of the Temple of the Sun; they are respectively 63 feet 8 inches, 60 feet 3 inches, and 64 feet 2 inches long. On the northern face, the face shown in our woodcut, six blocks of hardly less astonishing size form by themselves

The effects of this propensity are to be most clearly traced in the wall which still exists on the south and west of the island of Arvad (Fig. 7). "Carried on the outer edges of the rocks, it is composed of quadrangular prisms ten feet high and from about twelve to sixteen feet long; these prisms are fixed sometimes with skill and care, sometimes with strange negligence; in some places joints are allowed to vertically coincide, in others they are alternated with great elaboration. Sometimes the courses are regular, with their interstices closed by small blocks; elsewhere they are not even dressed to an even front, although the lines of the courses are always horizontal. The ruling idea of the builders was to make the best possible show with the finest blocks. A huge stone commanded its own place. No sacrifice of its mass was made, it was put wherever its size would be most imposing, and the hollows about it were filled in with smaller stones. . . . There was no cement . . . . I do not think there is any ruin in the world more imposing, more characteristic. There can be no doubt that it is a relic from the ancient city of Arvad, a really Phœnician work, and affording a criterion for other buildings of the same origin. It is entirely built of the indigenous stone of the place; its materials were taken, in fact, from the great ditch which separates it from the modern town."[1]

The solidity of this architecture was not in due proportion to the size of its units.[2] To obtain the height they required the builders were often obliged to bed the stone the wrong way; the slightest "vent" was then fatal to the structure. And the limestone of those coasts is apt to crumble, so that small stones when asked to support great blocks were crushed by their weight; this we find

a wall 60 feet long. M. DE SAULCY believes that these enormous substructures date from an epoch much earlier than the temples they support (*Revue Archéologique*, 2nd series, vol. xxxiii. p. 267); other travellers think the same, notably M. G. REY (*Rapport sur une Mission en Syrie*, in the *Archives des Missions*, 1866, p. 329). To me, however, the hypothesis in question is rendered very doubtful by the simple fact that these gigantic stones rest upon courses of well-jointed masonry in which the single stones are of comparatively small size. Taken by themselves, we should hardly refer these courses to an earlier epoch than that of the Seleucidæ. Moreover, we find that in the undoubtedly Roman parts of the work units of extraordinary size have been used, as, for example, in the monolithic jambs of the doorway of the round temple, which dates from the decadence. See M. RENAN'S reflections on this subject and the doubt he expresses as to the theory of M. de Saulcy (*Mission*, pp. 314-316).

[1] RENAN, *Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 39, 40, and plate ii. [2] *Ibid.* p. 67.

has happened in the temple at Amrit to the blocks interposed between the monolithic base and the huge slab which forms the roof. These smaller stones are greatly frayed away, and will in time be reduced to powder. Add to all this that the inequality in the materials and the method of filling in renders these Syrian structures very sensible to the shocks of earthquakes, and it will be understood that they are farther removed from the solidity of native rock than those Greek structures in which smaller units were used, but used with a skill that endowed them with a high power of resistance.

The habits contracted in its early years never entirely disappeared from Phœnician architecture. In Greek construction each stone had its own part to play in the work to which it



FIG. 43.—Square pier from Gebal. Height 35 inches. From Renan.

belonged; it was the member of an organic body, and the Greeks understood at a very early date that not more than one member should be combined with each constructive unit. In Syria the architectural idea and the constructive units did not preserve this logical connection; when the Phœnicians made use of the column, they, like the Assyrians, carved it all, shaft and cap, from a single block. We take an example of this from the ruins of Gebal (Fig. 43).[1]

To their fondness for using the stone as it came from the quarry may be traced the Phœnician habit of employing what is called rustication; it seemed natural to their masons to be content with dressing the edges of the joints and to leave the rest of their wall-

[1] RENAN, *Mission de Phénicie*, p. 175, and plate XXV.

faces in their native rudeness. For a long time, in fact, this arrangement was looked upon as the distinctive peculiarity of Phœnician masonry, as the stamp by which it could be most easily and most surely recognized. The rampart of Tortosa, the castle at Gebal, and certain parts of the "Tower of the Algerines" at



FIG. 44.—Wall of Tortosa. From Renan.

Sour, where the irregular courses are made to fit by the introduction of L-shaped stones (see Fig. 45) were looked upon as standard examples.[1] This notion must now, however, be abandoned. M. Thobois, the architect who accompanied M. Renan examined all these structures very carefully, and the result of his



FIG. 45.—Masonry from the Tower of the Algerines. From Renan.

observations caused the latter to reconsider his first ideas. It now seems to be clearly proved that the walls of Tortosa and those of the castle at Gebal both date from the middle ages.[2] The masons employed by the great military orders in the construction of these walls went to the quarry for no great proportion of the blocks they used; they made the stones of the old buildings with which the Phœnician coast had been fringed for so many generations serve again in the new, and the narrow, smoothly

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, plate XXV.

[2] See M. RENAN's observations on this subject (*Mission*, pp. 47-54 and 164-172). The question was one of great importance. Upon its resolution in one sense or the other depended, in no slight degree, our notions upon the habits and processes of the Phœnician architect.

chiselled border in which the hand of the Giblite masons was formerly seen is no more than the signature of those who worked for the Hospitallers and Templars.

On the other hand, many examples of channelled masonry may be found among the antique monuments of Judæa, of that Judæa which was the scholar of Phœnicia in all the manual arts. It appears difficult to allow that the Jews made use of methods un-

FIG. 46.—Wall of a temple at Malta.

known to the Phœnicians, but it is none the less certain that the only really ancient building in Phœnicia in which this channelled masonry has been encountered is the tomb at Marath, known as the *Burdj-el-Bezzak*, or "Tower of the Snail" (Fig. 6). There we find a very strongly marked rustication, but only on the substructure.[1] To find another example we have to come down to a

[1] See RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 80-90, and plate xiv.

temple dating from the reign of Augustus, the ruins of which are to be seen at El Belat, in the neighbourhood of Byblos.[1] No rustication is to be found either at Arvad, or in those parts of the walls of Sidon which are believed to be Phœnician (Fig. 41).[2]

We must then, at least for the present, give up the notion of seeing a characteristic of Phœnician architecture in this way of finishing a wall. On the other hand, all the examinations that have been made, outside Syria, of buildings ascribed to the Phœnicians on one ground or another, confirm what we have said as to their love for materials of great size, often but roughly dressed and laid one upon another without cement. Sometimes, as for example in



FIG. 47.—The wall of Byrsa. From Beulé

the monuments of Malta and Gozo, there are no regular courses; the walls look like the primitive Cyclopean walls of Greece. We give an instance of this in Fig. 46, which shows one entrance to the building whose still unexplored ruins are to be seen at Malta, at *Burdj-en-Nadur*, above the port of Marsasirocco, and about 280 yards from the sea.[3]

At Carthage, on the other hand, in those walls of Byrsa which were disengaged at several points by Beulé—only, however, to be

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 223.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 362, and plate lviii. figs. 1, 2, and 3.

[3] A. CARUANA, *Report on the Phœnician and Roman Antiquities in the Group of the Islands of Malta* (8vo, Malta, 1882), pp. 17-19.

very soon covered up again by the fall of the excavated earth—a masonry hardly inferior to that of the Greeks may be recognized; but the blocks are larger as a rule than those employed in Greece; some of the stones are five feet long, more than four feet high, and between three and four deep, measurements which give a cube of considerable size (Fig. 47).[1]

Having thus an abundant supply of easily worked rock close at hand, the Phœnicians of Syria seem to have made no use of artificial stone, at least before the Roman period. No brick structure has been found in the country. Elsewhere, however, they did not refuse to employ a material which must have become well known to them during their voyages into Egypt and Mesopotamia. It has been asserted that some of the Cyprian temples ascribed to the Phœnicians have been been built on a system often followed in Assyria. They have crude brick walls standing on a substructure of masonry.[2]

§ 2.—*Forms.*

The monuments of which the soil of Phœnicia can still show some traces may be divided into three classes:—

1. Old monuments, dating from a time anterior to the first glimmerings of Greek taste; as, for example, the remains at Amrit (Figs. 6 and 40).

2. Mixed monuments, on which the ideas, habits, and style of Phœnicia have left their trace, but which date from the Greek or Roman periods and bear the mark of Græco-Roman influence; of such is the stone in the baptistery of Gebal (Fig. 48).[3]

3. Monuments purely Greek or Roman, such as the theatre at Batroun.[4]

Here we have nothing to do with monuments in the last-named category; as for those in the second they afford many useful points of comparison, and the persistence with which motives quite Oriental in character hold their ground proves how dear they were

[1] BEULÉ, *Fouilles à Carthage* (4to, 1861, 6 plates), pp. 59-62.

[2] G. COLONNA CECCALDI, *Revue Archéologique* (2nd series, vol. xxii. p. 362).

[3] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 157, 158.

[4] M. RENAN was the first to establish this classification; its foundations appear sound (*Ibid.* pp. 835, 836).



FIG. 48.—Entablature from a temple at Byblos. Louvre. Drawn by Wallet.

to the Syrian ornamentist and how hard he found it to abandon their use.

Thanks to the collateral evidence furnished by the numerous buildings which maritime Syria erected during the period of the Seleucidæ and the Roman emperors, we ought to be able, with sufficient ease and certainty, to formulate the governing theory of her architectural forms and decorative principles, but the present miserable condition of the remains both of ancient Phœnicia and of Phœnicia after classic art began to affect her, is the cause of very great embarrassment. The works of Syrian artists had no protecting garment like the sands of Egypt or the crude brick crumbled of the Assyrian palaces. Neither had the ruins on the Phœnician coast the good fortune to stand in a district almost devoid of population, like the Haouran and the north-west of Syria. The desert is the most faithful of all curators, but in the narrow lands of maritime Syria, which have never ceased to be well peopled, to be washed by the rains of winter and by mountain torrents, only those works of man could subsist which were either hidden in the bowels of the earth or, when raised above its surface, were protected by

the unwieldy size of their materials and by the equilibrium that results from extreme simplicity of plan.

It would then be futile to expect anything in Syria that could be compared to the hypostyle halls of Egypt and Persia or to the Assyrian palaces. The chief remains, and those in very bad condition, are sepulchral pits, small buildings resembling not a little both in solidity and in appearance the rocks of which their bases form a part, fragments of walls, cones and pyramids raised upon tombs, and monolithic chapels. Our hopes of new discoveries are not very sanguine, and meanwhile we must do the best we can with those already made, and endeavour to define what appear to have been the characteristic forms of Phœnician architecture. Our aim is to give a true description of its spirit and general methods. If we succeed, the surprises which the future may, after all, have in reserve, will enable our successors to fill in our definitions and to enrich them with details now beyond our grasp, but our framework will remain in spite of all retouches.

In all the really ancient fragments of Phœnician buildings that remain to us the shape of the stones is rarely, if ever, determined by the functions they have to fulfil. Each block did not become, as in Greece, a separate unit with an individuality of its own. If there be any one mode of construction that leads more surely to this individuality of the unit than another it is the vault, where each voussoir has its own special form and is only fitted for that particular spot in the curve for which it has been prepared. But the vault is generally the result of a desire to employ small materials, to cover a void with stones too small for use in any other fashion ; and we have seen that the Phœnicians had a strong predilection for large stones, which they could obtain everywhere at the very foot of any work on which they might be engaged ; so that the habits and preferences of their builders did not predispose them to make use of the arch. They must have been acquainted with its principle, seeing how incessantly they travelled in Egypt and Mesopotamia ; but hardly a sign of it is to be found in any building which we have good reason to ascribe to them either upon the soil of Syria or in any of the colonies. The only monuments in which that system of covering a void has been used, so far as we know, are two or three sepulchres in the necropolis of Sidon, among them that of Esmounazar, and these are scarcely older

than the time of Alexander.[1] Nowhere else do we find the slightest trace of a voussoir. This well-ascertained fact confirms the hypothesis to which our reasoning has been directed. If the Phœnicians made use of the vault at all, it was at long intervals and on quite exceptional occasions. It is difficult to see how any arch whatever could be introduced into such walls as those of Arvad or of the temples of Malta and Gozo, among blocks which the mason set in place exactly as they came from the quarry. On the other hand, nothing could be easier than to cover any opening, lintel-wise, with the longest stone that might happen to be at hand. Other blocks of the same nature furnished the horizontal lines of the cornice, which, moreover, they soon learnt to chisel into ornamental forms. Every building must have ended in a flat roof, a covering which is almost universal in Syria at the present day.[2]

Another characteristic of Phœnician architecture is to be explained by its early predilections. Born of the living rock, which it fashioned in a hundred ways, on which it reposed, which it continued and prolonged, it had no liking for any kind of open construction, and especially made slight use of the pier and column.

Very few fragments of columns, and those very small, have been found among the ruins of truly Phœnician buildings. A study of these remains brings out the fact that columns were almost always used as ornamental motives in the form of pilasters. They did not support the roof and framework of the building as in Egypt, Persia, and Greece.

Reduced thus to play the part of a mere accessory, the column was not divided into different members, as it was among people who made a wider use of it. It was not turned into a kind of organic being by separating and clearly defining its different parts. We do not possess a single Phœnician base, but the capital, as in Assyria, was in one piece with the shaft. The column was, as a rule, a monolith, and on those few occasions when it was made up

[1] In our chapter on "Sepulchral Architecture" we shall give a section of these tombs, taken from the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*. See also in M. GAILLARDOT'S journal of his excavations (*Mission*, p. 437) the mention of another arched tomb chamber. It contained an anthropoid sarcophagus.

[2] "The early Phœnicians were unacquainted with the arch," says M. RENAN (*Mission*, p. 408).

of several pieces, as in some of the Cyprian remains in the Louvre, the sections occurred at random, being governed only by the shape and size of the stones, and not by the natural articulations of the support as a whole.

This being their general character, we have now to distinguish the peculiarities, I can hardly say of the Phœnician column,



FIG. 49.—Capital at Golgos. From Ceccaldi.[1]

because that had no constant and well-marked features of its own, but of those columns which have been found in Phœnicia and Cyprus.

As a rule, their shafts are smooth and without fluting. The forms of the capitals have much variety. In some we find the



FIG. 50.—Capital from Eddé. From Renan.

elements of the Grecian Doric capital, but with different curves and proportions. The nearest approach to the classic type has been found at Golgos (Fig. 49). The slight salience of the echinus and the great thickness of the abacus give a more peculiar physiognomy to one from Eddé, near Byblos (Fig. 50).

[1] *Monuments antiques de Cypre*, p. 42.

The Tuscan capital, as described by Vitruvius, must have been very much like this. In the same group we may place the capital of a square pier at Byblos (Fig. 43), which has a quite peculiar profile. The shaft ends in a bold torus, which, again, is allied to the abacus by a scotia.[1]

In some other examples we recognize the principle of the Ionic capital. Several have been brought from Cyprus, where they crowned columns which once, in all probability, formed parts of tombs. They are very ornate. The simplest, which was found at Trapeza, near Famagousta, has two large volutes rising from a single base and crossing each other at the foot, and surmounted by an abacus divided into three fascias. It is ornamented on

Fig. 51.—Cypriot capital. Louvre.[2]

both faces (Fig. 51). A capital from Athieno is still more curious in its arrangements. Above the chief pair of volutes there are two more turned the other way up. The space between their curves is filled up with a graceful ornament of lotus flowers and stems. A less happy note is struck by the sharp point of the triangle which rises between the two large volutes. The three fascias of the abacus have perpendicular markings or grooves (Fig. 52). In a third capital we find the same design carried out in a slightly more elaborate fashion. There are three pairs of volutes instead of two ; the lotus bouquet is a little fuller and more complex, and the abacus is decorated with chevrons instead of

[1] Renan, *Mission*, p. 175.

[2] Height, 30 inches ; length of abacus, 49 inches ; thickness, 12 inches.

vertical strokes (Fig. 53). Unfortunately this capital is in much worse condition than the other two; both the great volutes have been broken off, and it has suffered in other respects. When

FIG. 52.—Cypriot capital. Louvre.[1]

perfect, it may perhaps have been the *chef d'œuvre* of the Cyprian decorator. It shows both invention and richness of taste, but as a whole it is a little heavy; it is the outcome of an art which,



FIG 53.—Cypriot capital. Louvre.

though not content with the first thing that comes, has not yet learnt to choose, to refine, to carry out with a light and discriminating hand. At Cyprus this heaviness of terminal forms was

[1] Height, 42 inches; length of abacus, 47 inches; thickness, 8 inches.

sometimes still more marked, as, for instance, in the ornament from a funerary stele which we reproduce in Fig. 54. The lower part of this monument has disappeared, but judging from the shape of its crown it must have seemed poor and meagre in comparison with the tablet and the two lions crowded on to it.



FIG. 54.—Ornament from a Cypriot stele. Louvre.[1]

The Cypriot capitals had, then, plenty of variety. There are one or two among them in which we seem to recognize a first sketch for the Corinthian capital. We have its skeleton, so to speak, in a fragment from Athieno which is only known to us in a mediocre

FIG. 55.—Cypriot capital. From Ceccaldi.[2]

drawing here reproduced (Fig. 55). Its principal member is a *calathos*, as the Greeks called it, a mass in the form of an inverted

[1] Extreme width, 38 inches.

[2] *Monuments antiques de Cypre*, p. 43 The longest side of the abacus measures 23 inches.

bell with a flat bottom and a decoration of sinuous vertical streaks. Upon this rests a thin abacus standing out far beyond the cap it covers. Another capital from the same place is rather less far removed from the Greek type we have mentioned. The calathos is ornamented with leafy branches, reminding us of the acanthus leaves on the same part of the Corinthian capital. A very thick abacus is decorated with three rows of chevrons, each row separated from those above and below it by fillets (Fig. 56). The worst fault of this design lies in its bad proportions, but, as a whole, it is more fantastic than the capitals with volutes, whose curves, suggested to the architect by the behaviour of copper or silver under the hammer, are never without a certain grace.



FIG. 56.—Cypriot capital. From Ceccaldi.[1]

It must have been in capitals of this latter form that metal supports, or wooden columns overlaid with metal, terminated. In Phœnicia, as in Egypt and Chaldæa, these slender shafts must sometimes have been used, as, for instance, in the support of the salient parts of a building or of porticoes. The penthouse of the Amrit tabernacle seems to have been thus upheld by bronze columns of which traces have been found on the entablature.[2] Not that the latter requires any supports, but the probability of their having nevertheless existed is rendered very strong by the arrangements of the hypogeum near Cagliari, known as the *Serpent*

[1] *Monuments antiques de Cypre*, p. 44. The greatest width of the abacus is 12½ inches.

[2] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 63, 64.

Grotto (Fig. 57). This monument seems to date from the Roman decadence, but there are peculiarities about it which deserve attention. To the under surface of the architrave the remains of one or two capitals still cling, which, by their size, must have belonged to very slender shafts indeed, so slender that it is in the last degree unlikely that their material was stone.[1] Phœnician was still spoken and written in Sardinia after the Roman conquest,[2] and there is nothing surprising in the fact that architects and ornamentists should also have preserved their taste for arrangements with which they had become familiar during the long Phœnician supremacy.



FIG. 57.—The Serpent Grotto. From Chipiez.[3]

Besides the columns we have just described, which served either as real or make-believe supports, the temples of Phœnicia and of the countries over which her influence extended seem to have possessed others which upheld nothing, but played a part not unlike that of the Egyptian obelisks. No examples of these columns have come down to us, but they may be recognized on several of those coins whose types show the fronts of Phœnician or Cypriot temples, on those, for instance, which preserve the appearance of

[1] CHIPIEZ, *Histoire critique de l'Origine et de la Formation des Ordres grecs*, p. 121.
[2] See *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. Nos. 143 and 149.
[3] *Histoire critique de l'Origine et de la Formation des Ordres grecs*, p. 121.

the famous temple at Paphos as it was in the time of the Roman supremacy (Fig. 58). Moreover, in speaking of the Syrian and Phœnician temples, classic authors often mention the tall pillars which rose in couples before the sanctuary. In the temple of Melkart at Gades they were of bronze, eight cubits high, and bore a long inscription.[1] In the shrine of the same deity at Tyre the admiration of Herodotus was stirred by the sight of two shafts, one of pure gold, he says, the other of emerald, that is, of lapis-lazuli or coloured glass.[2] These shafts or steles probably stood in similar places to those occupied, at Jerusalem, by Jachin and Boaz, the two famous bronze columns which rose at the threshold of

FIG. 58.—Coin of Cyprus. Enlarged.[3]

a building also erected by a Phœnician architect.[4] Finally we must recognize forms of the same nature in the two "very large phalluses" erected on the threshold of the temple at Hierapolis, in Upper Syria, where the goddess Atergatis was worshipped.[5]

These pillars were perhaps in the beginning emblematic in

[1] STRABO, iii. v. 5.

[2] HERODOTUS, ii. 44. The historian uses the word στῆλαι, which could hardly be applied to pillars as high as those upon the coin of Paphos.

[3] From DONALDSON'S *Architectura Numismatica*.

[4] We shall have occasion to return to these columns when we come to speak of Solomon's temple.

[5] PSEUDO-LUCIAN, *The Syrian Goddess*, § 16; STRABO, xvi. i. 27.

character. This we may gather from an expression used by the author of the curious work *Upon the Syrian Goddess*. It is possible that they were, in fact, symbols of the creative power as represented by the male organ of generation. The fork at their summit may have something to do with the double tongue of a flame blown about by the wind, which may account for their name of *Khammanim*, which often occurs in the Hebrew books of the Old Testament, and has been referred to the root *kham*, which means "to be warm, burning".[1]

Whatever the truth may be as to the origin of these things, it is unlikely that any great stress was laid on the exact imitation of forms which had nothing architectural about them. In time the primitive sense of these piers was lost to sight, and their shapes modified by the ornaments placed at the top of them.

The earliest Phœnician columns of any size of which the memory has come down to our times were not supports but, like the Egyptian obelisks, at once symbols and decorative elements. At first we may feel some surprise that the Phœnicians, who were the pupils of Egypt rather than Chaldæa, and had in abundance the stone denied to the latter country, should have taken the Mesopotamian architects as their models in this matter of the column, rather than those of Memphis and Thebes. The true explanation of this singularity is to be found perhaps in the general poverty of Phœnician architecture. If Phœnicia did not build hypostyle halls like those of Egypt, it was because she never dreamt of undertaking any such gigantic works as those on which the Pharaohs employed armies of their own subjects and every prisoner they could take in war. Phœnicia was unable to indulge in such luxuries. Her largest cities were villages beside Memphis and Thebes and Sais; her population even at the time of her greatest prosperity was not more, perhaps, than a million souls, including slaves; it was hardly more than enough to carry on her industries, and to man her vessels. To have attempted anything that could be even remotely compared to the

[1] The name of Hammon, the solar god, the god of fire, seems to come from the same root. To my mind some doubt is cast upon this explanation, however, by the fact that in all the best specimens of the coinage in question, which I examined in the *Cabinet des Medailles*, the round knobs at the ends of the two forks are never absent. But whether a flame is quiet or blown by the wind it has nothing that can be compared to these globes, which were, in all probability, of bronze gilt.

wonders of Luxor and Karnak would have been to squander her vital forces. The Phœnicians were too economical, their intellects were too practical, for such ambitions as these. The only great works to which they turned with real good will seem to have been such as were of public utility; the embankments, for instance, by which they increased the actual superficies of Tyre, and made it better fitted for the storage of merchandise, for the loading and discharging of ships.[1] The same readiness was shown when the question was one of dredging the harbours or closing their entrances against an enemy, of providing a supply of water, either for maritime Tyre or for the town on the mainland; but, so far as we can tell, temples and palaces remained comparatively small; they were distinguished rather by wealth of decoration than by magnificence of plan. The apparent anomaly is to be accounted for by the utilitarian character which distinguished Phœnician civilization from the beginning to the end.

But although the Phœnician merchants refused to follow the lead of the Egyptians in the matter of splendid architecture, none the less do we constantly encounter proofs of the dominating influence exercised by Egyptian art over that of Phœnicia. To be convinced of this we need only glance at their details. The tufa and shelly limestone of Syria was less well adapted to receive and preserve the work of the chisel than the marble of Greece; it was even excelled by the fine limestone from the Mokattam and the sandstone from Gebel-Silsilis of Egypt, while the stucco under which the coarseness of its grain was mostly disguised has now disappeared, at least from those monuments which are really ancient. But in what little remains to us of the works of Phœnician builders it is the taste of Egypt that is to be recognized in the choice and arrangement of the ornamental motives.

[1] MENANDER, quoted by Josephus (*Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, Muller, vol. iv. p. 446, fragm. i.). Another historian, DIOS, mentions the same works, and his testimony has also been preserved for us by Josephus (*Apion.* i. 17).

§ 3.—*Decoration.*

So far as we can tell from the remains, the Phœnician architect, like his brother of Egypt, had but one way of finishing his buildings at the top. His entablatures were composed of

FIG. 59.—Egyptian Coffer. Louvre. Drawn by St. Elme-Gautier.

an architrave and a cornice, the section of the latter almost always the same as that Egyptian gorge which is to be found on every ancient building from one end of the Nile valley to the other. To recall its form to our readers, we here reproduce an Egyptian coffer of painted wood, in which the general appearance of a stone

building is copied in small (Fig. 59). Its cornice is practically identical with that of the tabernacle at Amrit (Fig. 40); we find the same sections in a stone beam surmounting a wall near Saïda (Fig. 60), which is certainly not the place for which it was originally made.[1]



FIG. 60.—Phœnician cornice. From Renan.

In one of the tabernacles at Amrit the cornice proper is crowned by a row of uræi, each with a solar disk upon his head (Fig. 61). This is the richest and amplest entablature to be found upon a Phœnician building, and it is nothing but a variation upon an Egyptian motive.[2] It must have been in frequent



FIG. 61.—Details of a cornice. From Renan.

use in Phœnicia. We find it again in a small object found at Saïda, on which is carved a small seated god (Fig. 62). The figure has been almost destroyed by blows with a knife, but the row of asps at the top of the stone may be easily recognized.

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 507, 508.
[2] *History of Art in Ancient Egypt*, vol. ii. p. 152, Fig. 136.

A cornice simpler in its decoration, but with a good section, is that on the tomb at Amrit known as the *Bordj-el-Bezzak* (Fig. 6). It is composed of a cyma-reversa surmounted by a deep fillet (Fig. 63). We may also cite as showing some interesting features, the mouldings on a little building in which one of those tombs of

FIG. 62.—Sculptured fragment. From Renan.



FIG. 63.—Cornice on a tomb. From Renan.

Adonis, which appear to have been so numerous in the district about Byblos, has been recognized.[1] The principal fragment was found in place. It ornamented the foot of the external wall of the cella, of which only the lower courses have survived (Fig. 64). The torus and cavetto, which were found among the *débris* heaped



FIG. 64.—Moulding from a plinth.



FIGS. 65 and 66.—Mouldings from the base of a pyramidion. From Renan.

about the cella, belonged, according to the architect by whom they were studied, to the base of the pyramidion with which the monument was crowned (Figs. 65 and 66).

Again, on a piece of money struck at Byblos in the time of

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 285 288. In his plate xxxv. M. Thobois proposes what seems to be a very plausible restoration of this monument.

Heliogabalus, there is figured a building with a cornice of very peculiar design (Fig. 67). Some of its elements are pure Greek, but the cornice with its convex segmental section and its vertical

FIG. 67.—Coin of Byblos, enlarged. From Donaldson.

grooves has nothing classic about it. So far as we can judge from the representation given by the engraver it is more like some of the Assyrian entablatures than anything else.[1]



FIG. 68.—Elevation of the doorway at *Oum-el-Awamid* and section of the lintel. From Renan.

The openings of doors were surrounded by flat architraves, that which formed the lintel being adorned with the winged disk. The best preserved example of the Phœnician doorway which has come

[1] See *A History of Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, Vol. I. Figs. 41 and 42.

down to us is that studied by MM. Renan and Thobois at *Oum-el-Awamid* (Fig. 68). The two little people at the angles of the architrave should be noticed. Their head-dress resembles the Egyptian *pschent*. The figure on the right holds a star-shaped flower, supported on a tall stem; it is more difficult to make out what his companion on the left has in his hand.

In Phœnicia the winged globe is generally flanked by those two long wings which always accompany it in Egypt, but here the importance of the motive is sometimes diminished. In one of the fragments found at *Oum-el-Awamid* the wings are suggested merely by a few feathers appearing from under the disk (Fig. 69). In another variety of the type, from the same place, the ornament is complicated by the introduction of a crescent and subordinate disk (Fig. 70). By this the meaning of the group is rendered



FIG. 69.—Winged globe. From Renan.



FIG. 70.—Winged globe with crescent. From Renan.

even more obvious than it is in the Egyptian form; the least educated eye is able to see that it forms a symbol and relic of that star worship to which the Assyrians made continual allusion when they placed the sun, moon, and stars on their steles and cylinders.[1] The peculiarly Phœnician element in this group is the combination of a disk and a crescent. Does the disk stand for the sun or a star? or, does the combination refer to the two states of the moon, new and at the full? It is difficult to say; but whatever the real explanation may be this particular form of the winged globe is to be met with in a great many of those votive steles erected at Carthage in honour of Tanit, of which we have already given more than one example (Fig. 71). It is peculiar to Phœnicia; we find it on all kinds of objects issued from the workshops of Tyre and Carthage; it becomes, in fact, a kind of trade mark by which

[1] *History of Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, Vol. I. pp. 70-75.

we can recognize as Phœnician all such objects as bear it, whether they come from Etruria or Sardinia, from Africa or Syria.[1]

Take for instance a little marble column in the Louvre (Fig. 72); even if we did not know that it was brought from Tyre in 1852 by de Saulcy, we should not hesitate to declare its Phœnician origin. Its summit is crowned by an ornament made up of four petalled flowers, divided in the centre by a bud like that of the lotus. All this is Egyptian, but beneath the winged globe which appears rather lower down the shaft we encounter the disk and



FIG. 71.—Sidereal symbols from a Carthaginian stele. French National Library.

FIG. 72.—Marble column. Louvre. Height 26 inches.

crescent, and all doubt as to the *provenance* of the monument is at once removed. We may say, in fact, that it is signed.

A conventional form whose Egyptian origin is no less certain is that of the sphinx. The Phœnician decorators seem to have made frequent use of it; in almost every case they gave it wings. The Phœnician sphinxes, like those of Egypt, were often sculptured in the round and placed at the entrance to buildings. An instance of this is to be seen at Oum-el-Awamid, among the ruins of what

[1] These groups of globe and crescent are found in the cemeteries of Sardinia in great numbers. See *Bollettino Archeologico Sardo*, vol. ii. p. 36; and vol. iii. pp. 105-107.

was once in all probability a temple.[1] The arms of a throne whose fragments were found on the same spot seem also to have been formed of sphinxes.[2] Elsewhere we find the same creatures chiselled in bas-relief. An alabaster slab from Arvad, on which

FIG. 73.—Alabaster slab. Louvre. Height 24½ inches.

the carving is very minutely carried out, is an example of this (Fig. 73). The sphinx is there couchant on a pedestal similar to

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 701-702, and plates xxxii. i.; li. k.; and lvii. i.

[2] M. THOBOIS gives a restoration of this throne (*Mission*, pl. liii.). We do not reproduce it here because it is, by his own confession, very conjectural, and because the sphinxes of his version are very conventional in form, recalling works of the time of Hadrian rather than the sculptured imitations from the Saite epoch of which M. Renan speaks.

those which lined the avenues of the Pharaonic temples;[1] it has the uræus on its brow, and the double crown, or pschent. Judging from these features it must have been copied from those Egyptian monsters whose heads were portraits of the kings by whose orders they were raised.[2]

But although the pose and head-dress speak of Egypt, the wings of this sphinx, both by their shape and presence, recall the winged monsters of Assyria. Winged sphinxes were very rare in the Nile valley,[3] but whenever the great composite animal of Egypt was imitated in Assyria it was endowed with wings,[4] and in every example to which we can point they were rather short and turned upwards at the end. This motive occurs on a large number of objects which we have every reason to ascribe to

FIG. 74.—Egyptian winged sphinx. From Prisse.

Mesopotamia, on a stone plaque carved with a very fantastic monster [5] on a fine cylinder,[6] upon a cone inscribed with Aramæan characters.[7] In all these the wings are more or less decidedly curled back on themselves. The Phœnician artists seem to

[1] *History of Art in Ancient Egypt*, Vol. I. Fig. 205.

[2] See Renan's observations upon this slab and upon another of the same class (Fig. 76); *Mission*, pp. 23-25. The lithographic reproductions given in his plate iv. are so wanting in clearness that we have been compelled to have these objects re-drawn from the originals, which are now, happily, in the Louvre.

[3] WILKINSON, *The Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, vol. iii. p. 310.

[4] *Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, Vol. I. Fig. 83; Vol. II. Figs. 58 and 59.

[5] *Ibid.* Vol. II. Fig. 87.

[6] *Ibid.* Fig. 141.

[7] *Ibid.* Fig. 157.

have universally adopted the same form; it is to be found both on their metal platters and on their engraved stones (Fig. 75). Like the group of crescent and globe it may be looked upon as a

Fig. 75.—Phœnician scarabæoid. Grey lapis. Twice the size of the original. From the Danicourt Collection.

trade mark whereby to distinguish between a scarab made in Phœnicia and one of true Egyptian origin.

We again find these upturned wings on another slab belonging to the same architectural whole as that reproduced in Fig. 73.

Fig. 76.—Alabaster slab. Louvre.[1]

Here we see two creatures fronting each other (Fig. 76); from the feathers on their heads they seem to be meant for griffins. It will be remembered that the taste for figures put face to face

[1] Height 20 inches. Drawn by Bourgoin.

is Assyrian rather than Egyptian;[1] the Egyptian decorator loved to place his figures back to back;[2] the converse arrangement, as we may see by turning over the pages of any work on Mesopotamian art, was preferred by the Assyrian.[3] He was continually using pairs of human figures and of real or fictitious animals, and he always made them face each other, but with a barrier between in the shape of a vase, an altar, a column, a rosette, or a palmette.[4]

This palmette is also to be commonly met with in Phœnicia, but, true to its character as a borrowed motive, it is there even more conventional in form than in Assyria. Its stem is a kind of architectonic column, with rudimentary volutes; its four or five leaves



FIG. 77.—Alabaster slab. Louvre.

are very symmetrical, even rigid; and on the whole it is much farther removed from the vegetable world than its Mesopotamian original.

Another favourite motive of the Assyrian ornamentist may be recognized in the cable which here divides the field of the lower relief from the compartment above.[5]

[1] *Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, Vol. II. page 338.
[2] *Art in Ancient Egypt*, Vol. II. Figs. 288, 311, 314, 327, 328.
[3] *Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, Vol. I. Figs. 8, 124, 138, 139; Vol. II. Figs. 120, 123, 141, 152, 153, 158, 209, &c.
[4] *Ibid.* Vol. I. Figs. 8, 81, 137, 138, 139; Vol. II. 253, 254, 255.
[5] *Ibid.* Vol. I. Figs. 126 and 137; Vol. II. plate xiii.

Finally, the Mesopotamian origin of the stepped ornament (Fig. 77) is no less certain. We have seen that it was employed at Nineveh as a border for enamelled bricks and frescoes ;[1] we have also met with it about the summit of an altar.[2] In Phœnicia it was used in the same way, to vary the aspect of a wide surface of stone and to give it a fitting crown.[3] Two slabs of alabaster now in the Louvre, but once in all probability part of the great temple at Byblos, are thus adorned (Fig. 77). This feature came into such universal use that we find it persisting even to the Roman period

FIG. 78.—Altar with stepped ornament. From Renan.

on such things as the altar inscribed with the name of the goddess Nesepteitis, which we reproduce (Fig. 78).[4] The rosette, too, which appears beneath these steps is of Assyrian origin. We give it on a larger scale in Fig. 79, so that the elegance of its lines may be better seen.

[1] *Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, Vol. I. Fig. 118 ; Vol. II. plate xiv.
[2] *Ibid.* vol. i. fig. 107.
[3] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 72, 162-164, 175, &c., and plates xi., xii., xiii., xx. and xxii.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 201, and plate xxii. No. 11.

We are again reminded of a motive we have met in Assyria by the balustrade-like ornament which occurs on some stone troughs found at Oum-el-Awamid (Fig. 80).[1] They are very like the little columns on one of the finest of the Ninevite ivories.[2] We find the same contrasts in both, between the expansive width of the



FIG. 79.—Rosettes enlarged. Louvre.

flower-like capitals and the neck which seems strangled by the cords which make several turns about the shaft. The same forms occur on a fragmentary relief found in the neighbourhood of Tyre, not far from Adloun, and now in the Louvre (Fig. 81).[3] On this little slab we can distinguish the left hand and knees of an enthroned personage, who grasps an object which we can hardly

FIG. 80.—Stone trough. From Renan.

define. Before him rises a kind of standard with a censer at the top, which must have been of bronze. In its construction it

[1] *Ibid.* p. 708.
[2] *Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, Vol. I. Fig. 129.
[3] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 654.

reminds us of Assyrian furniture.[1] The *pschent*-covered head in the lower left-hand corner forms part of the throne. It is

FIG. 81.—Fragment of relief. Height 6¾ inches.

quite Egyptian in character. On the other hand the frame of the picture is formed of the Assyrian palmette. Some candelabra of the same kind have been recognized on the votive steles of



FIGS. 82 and 83.—Candelabra figured on a stele. French National Library.

Carthage (Figs. 82 and 83).[2] In one of the two the flame at the summit is very clearly indicated.

[1] *Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, Vol. II. Figs. 193, 195, 196, 200.

[2] BERGER, *Les Ex-voto du Temple de Tanit à Carthage*, p. 29.

Finally we may cite a last monument which has unhappily suffered even more than the one we have just described. It comes from the same district. In the only feature of the decoration that is now recognizable, we see a stem supporting a head of falling leaves, which, again, is surmounted by a globular fruit (Fig. 84).[1] But the condition of the stone is such that we can form no probable conjecture as to its purpose.

We have tried to make this catalogue of the elements of Phœnician decoration complete, but nevertheless we should have a very imperfect conception of it if we forgot to take account of the part played by metal sheathings and by paint. The calcareous tufa of the country was not susceptible of any very delicate ornament, and it was quite by exception that granite, alabaster, or

FIG. 84.—Fragment of a sculptured slab. From Renan.

marble, brought from Egypt or the Greek islands, was used to case buildings constructed of inferior material. As a rule they were content with commoner stone, in spite of the unkindly way in which it lent itself to the work of the chisel—and they could always disguise its poverty under a casing of wood or metal. This casing has everywhere disappeared, but in the curled volutes and leafy decorations of the Cypriot capitals, we seem to recognize motives suggested to the ornamentist by the elasticity of bronze and by its behaviour under the hammer. In the temple at Jerusalem, which was built and decorated by Phœnician artists, the naked walls were nowhere left visible, at least in the interior.

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 658.

The stone was overlaid with panelling of cedar, with brass, silver, and gold.[1]

In this work of decoration colour could help, and sometimes, at least, it would give as good a result as a more costly lining. The few fragments we possess from buildings anterior to the Greek conquest have been so hardly treated by man and the weather, that no trace of stucco is now to be found upon them, but the remains of paintings have been encountered upon the walls of rock-cut tombs ;[2] steles, too, have been found on which the ornaments, the inscription, and even the portrait of the deceased are carried out in paint.[3] The Phœnician workman must have made good use of the palette and cups we find so often in Egyptian tombs (Fig. 85). The frescoes in the tombs and on the steles belong, it is true, to the Roman period, but while we explain their preservation to our own day by the shorter space of time



FIG. 85.—Egyptian palette. Louvre.

through which they have existed, we have no reason to suppose that such an obvious device for covering the porous stone walls of a hypogeum had not been used long before. In the two countries with which their intercourse was most intimate and continuous, in Egypt and Mesopotamia, the Phœnicians saw decoration in colour applied to vast surfaces with much taste and art. On those anthropoid sarcophagi which have been found wherever the Phœnicians established themselves, vestiges of paint still exist, some of which were very brilliant at the moment of discovery. The work of the brush is also conspicuous on one of the sepulchral

[1] 1 *Kings* vi. 15, 16, and 18: "And the cedar of the house within was carved with knops and open flowers; all was cedar; there was no stone seen."

[2] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 209, 380, 395, 408, 510.

[3] RENAN, *Mission*, pl. xliii., and CLERMONT-GANNEAU, *Stèles peintes de Sidon* (*Gazette archéologique*, 1877, p. 102, and plates 15, 16). The steles described by M. Clermont-Ganneau are now in the Louvre, in the *Salle des Peintures antiques*.

steles brought from Cyprus by Cesnola. It once had a band of colour all round it, and this can still be traced across the bottom of the monument.

Thanks to the judicious employment of all these subordinate means of adornment, the buildings of Phœnicia, while far inferior in their dimensions to those of Egypt and Mesopotamia, must have had a certain decorative beauty of their own. Herodotus speaks with admiration of the great sanctuary of Tyre, but if he had been an archæologist he would have been chiefly struck with the fact that all the elements of the decoration he saw about him were already known to him. Neither there nor in any of the buildings to which his Phœnician hosts took him in Syria could he have encountered a form or motive that did not recall something already seen at Memphis and Babylon.

CHAPTER III.

SEPULCHRAL ARCHITECTURE.

§ 1.—*The Ideas of the Phœnicians as to a Future Life.*

The Phœnicians have left us no literature in which to learn their ideas and sentiments upon death and its consequences, and there is nothing in the inscriptions on their tombs to fill up the void. Of these we possess a certain number, but, on the one hand, they are not very old, on the other, they are singularly short and dry. They give us the names and titles of the deceased, but not a hint of his beliefs and hopes.

To this there is but one exception, in the text engraved on the sarcophagus of Esmounazar, king of Sidon (Fig. 86).[1] This text runs to twenty-two long lines, and yet it tells us hardly anything of what we most want to know. It proves that the defunct had a very lively dread of violation for his tomb. It begins by declaring to all possible tomb-breakers and robbers that they will find nothing to reward their trouble. "Do not open this coffin for the sake of treasure; there are no treasures in it!" This is all very well, but the tomb-breaker may answer as he applies his crowbar, "Never mind; we will just see whether you speak the truth." Esmounazar foresees this peril, and he employs another means to stop those who may refuse to take him at his word. He invokes the aid of Astarte and other gods and goddesses against all who may disturb his rest, and prays that the latter may die childless, and may in their last sleep be denied that repose which they had refused to him. This solemn imprecation is repeated twice over, in almost identical terms, as if the author of the prayer thought by such means to give it a more certain efficacy.

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, part i. No. 3.

This horror of all interference with the tomb or disturbance of its inmate proves that the Phœnicians did not believe that all was



FIG. 86.—Sarcophagus of Esmounazar. Louvre.[1]

over when the breath left the body. Like the Egyptians and Chaldæans, they thought the dead man was sleeping in his

[1] Length, 8 feet 5 inches; greatest width, 4 feet 3 inches.

sepulchre, that in it he continued to live that imperfect and precarious life which we attempted to describe in the case of Egypt. One is, therefore, surprised to find no reference, direct or indirect, to any provision of funerary offerings such as those for which every Egyptian, were he never so humble, prayed perpetually in the words engraved on his stele.[1] No Phœnician tombs have been discovered in such a state that the silence of their inscriptions could be made up for by an inventory of their contents. Cords and bandages have sometimes left traces upon sarcophagi and tomb chambers, whence it has been concluded that certain practices in which the Egyptians excelled had their followers in Phœnicia.[2] Embalmed with more or less care and tied up in linen bandages, Phœnician corpses when ready for burial must have had much the look of mummies, but of mummies prepared with less scrupulous care and refinement than those of Egypt. When the corpse was placed in its human-headed sarcophagus, the opening of the ear was sometimes carried through the whole thickness of that stone envelope, as if to leave a free passage for the prayers of the living to the ears of the dead.[3] The sepulchral furniture differs little from what we found in Egypt and in Chaldæa. It comprises amulets, statuettes of tutelary divinities, and objects for the use of the dead.

But so far as we can discover, no eatables, either real or figured, have yet been found in Phœnician tombs; perhaps, however, this apparent difference between the practice of Syria and that of Egypt and Chaldæa is to be accounted for by the fact that in the first mentioned country no sepulchre has been found so intact as many of those in the valleys of the Nile and the Euphrates. Tombs were less carefully hidden in Phœnicia, and cemeteries were far less extensive. As a result of this we find that even in antiquity many sepulchres were used at second hand by those who had no right to them. These usurpations must have led to the dispersal of the original furnishing of any tomb in which they took place.

[1] *Art in Ancient Egypt*, Vol. I. pp. 140-145.

[2] DE LONGPÉRIER, *Musée Napoléon III.*, notice of plate xvii. RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 78 and 421. It would seem that the Jews sometimes embalmed corpses, in imitation of the Phœnicians. The Hebrew Scriptures tell us that this was done in the case of King Asa (2 *Chronicles* xvi. 14).

[3] DE LONGPÉRIER, *Musée Napoléon III.*, observations on plate xvii. An instance of this practice may be seen in a woman's sarcophagus which has been brought from the necropolis of Arvad to the Louvre.

In later years, too, seekers for treasure came to disturb the cemeteries in every direction. A virgin tomb is very rarely encountered on the Syrian coast. On the few occasions when such a burial-place has come under the eye of the explorer it has as a rule contained nothing but objects of the Græco-Roman period; it may have been originally made much earlier, but in the course of centuries its occupant had been changed. Under such conditions can we be surprised that the tomb preserved no traces of a rite which carries us back, by the beliefs it implies, to the very childhood of humanity?

There are, however, some indications which lead us to believe that Syria practised that worship of the dead which is based entirely upon the notion that in their subterranean homes the latter live a real life, a life sustained by the meat and drink furnished in perpetuity by pious survivors. Consult Deuteronomy, that collection of religious prescriptions which seems to have been published at Jerusalem under the last kings of Judah, when those monotheistic tendencies of the Jews which finally triumphed in the days of exile and captivity first began to show their strength.[1] In those days prophets and priests were struggling passionately against the gods who had disputed the hearts of the people with Jehovah for so many centuries. They were proscribing the Syrian worship and doing their best to bring its rites into disrepute, and nothing found less favour in their sight than this worship of the dead. Of this we have an indirect but certain proof in the form of confession imposed upon the worshipper of Jehovah when he brought his gifts to the altar.

"I have not eaten thereof in my mourning, neither have I taken away *ought* thereof for *any* unclean *use*, nor given *ought* thereof for the dead."[2]

The practice of giving food to the dead certainly implies a belief that the latter can make use of it, and that they are capable of rendering services to all who gain their favour. Among the Jews and among those peoples from whom they only separated

[1] According to M. E. REUSS, Deuteronomy is the code promulgated under Josiah in 623 (*La Bible, l'Histoire Sainte et la Loi*, vol i., Introduction, p. 160).

[2] *Deuteronomy* xxvi. 14. M. HALÉVY calls attention to this text in a remarkable study entitled *De l'Âme chez les Peuple sémitiques*, in the *Revue Archéologique* (1882, vol. xliv. p. 44). In the sequel we shall have frequent occasion to borrow from M. Halévy's paper, making use sometimes of his own words, but more often abridging them so as to keep within the space at our command.

themselves at a very late date, the notion was therefore general that death did not put an end to existence, and that a dead man continued to interest himself in the affairs of the world. They ascribed to him even higher powers than these; they believed he could see into the future, and that he could explain the most difficult secrets. Of this we have evidence in the often-repeated proscription of necromancy in the Mosaic law; the insistence with which they are forbidden proves the high favour of such divinations among the Hebrews.[1]

But in all this we are not left to mere conjecture; the account of the visit of Saul to the witch of Endor is direct proof of what we have said. The king wished to learn what would be the issue of the battle of Mount Gilboa, and as the best way to the desired result he made the witch raise the shade of Samuel, who, after complaining of being *brought up* again to earth, told the king that he and his sons should be with him on the morrow.[2]

The words of this account seem to hint that the writer of these passages believed the dead to be assembled in a single place, the *sheol* of the Hebrews. This idea explains the phrase which occurs so often in the Bible "He was gathered to his own people," or "to his fathers." Looking at it merely as an allusion to the grave its meaning is obscure, but it must rather be considered as referring to a posthumous life passed in a subterranean abode like that of the Greek Hades; and here we may quote those words in Job's complaint of life in which he describes the dwelling of the dead.[3]

"For now should I have lain still, and been quiet, I should have slept, then had I been at rest, with kings and counsellors of the earth, which built desolate places for themselves; or with princes that had gold, who filled their houses with silver; Or as an hidden untimely birth I had not been; as infants *which* never saw the light. There the wicked cease from troubling; and there the weary be at rest. There the prisoners rest together;

[1] Among those people that were "an abomination unto the Lord" figure "a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer" (*Deuteronomy* xviii. 11; see also *Leviticus* xix. 31, and xx. 6, 27). In a chapter of Samuel, to be quoted presently, we are told that Saul had put away *diviners and necromancers* out of the land (this is the translation given by M. Reuss [*devins et nécromanciers*] of the Hebrew text, 1 Samuel xxviii. 3).

[2] 1 *Samuel* xxviii.

[3] JOB iii. 13-19.

they hear not the voice of the oppressor. The small and great are there; and the servant is free from his master."

It will be seen how closely this description resembles that of the Assyrian under-world as given in the Descent of Istar.[1] Analogies of the same kind abound in other expressions applied to *sheol* in the Hebrew writings. It is painted as a place where men "make their beds in the darkness;"[2] the way thither is spoken of as a "way *whence* I shall not return."[3] *Sheol* had its barriers,[4] like the hell of Istar. When a great conqueror passed through them, the shades (*refaim*) of the kings rose from their couches to see whether it was really he who had made the earth tremble, and when they had recognized him they amused themselves by mocking at him.[5]

The data we have here brought together are sprinkled over the works of historians, poets, and other writers, who, in their monotheistic ardour were, one and all, bitterly hostile to the beliefs on which the worship of the dead was founded, and looked upon its rites as mortal sins. It was, then, only on rare occasions that they referred to *sheol* and its inhabitants, while their tendency was always to transform into a mere poetical image that which the people took in its literal sense. And yet even these fugitive allusions, I may even say these reticences, allow us to catch a glimpse of those popular conceptions which had in the end to give way before monotheism. In fact, the true national beliefs of Israel were not those set forth by the Hebrew prophets.[6] The more strongly an idea or custom was reprobated by the Hebrew legislators, the more deeply, we may take it, had its roots sunk into the imagination of the Jewish race.

The Jewish nation was distinguished from those by which it was surrounded in Syria by its gradual abandonment of polytheism for the worship of a single God. The lofty beliefs which it ended by embracing were its own peculiar glory, but it was not so with the notions they expelled. Homage rendered to the sun, to the moon and the rest of the celestial army, sacrifices offered in the sacred groves of the Baals and their corresponding goddesses, invocations of the dead and offerings of food on their tombs, all these are forbidden in the Bible, where they are spoken of as

[1] *Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, Vol. I. pp. 345-347.
[2] JOB xvii. 13. [3] *Ibid.* xvi. 22. [4] *Ibid.* xvii.
[5] ISAIAH xiv. 9-15. Cf. EZEKIEL xxxii. [6] J. HALÉVY, *loc. cit.* p. 50.

abominations borrowed by the Jews from their neighbours on the East, West, and North. The constant endeavour of the Hebrew prophets was to compel their countrymen to leave off thinking, feeling, or acting like the Canaanitish tribes among whom they found themselves placed; it is obvious, therefore, that from the rites and beliefs they forbade, we may form some idea of the common characteristics of the Syrian religions; we may supplement the meagre evidence of Phœnician inscriptions by the testimony of the Hebrew writers. Of all the western Semites the Jews alone had a literature, or, to speak more correctly, the Jewish literature alone has come down to our own time. Thanks to its extent and variety, this work has the merit of telling us a great deal more than the history of the Jewish mind; it makes us familiar with many of the thoughts and customs of other nations belonging to the same family. By the latter, few monuments have been sent down to posterity in which we can recognise the real tones of their voice and the sense of their words. But happily we have the Bible—the Bible of the Jews—from which we may gather so much authentic information upon a world from which they only emerged under their later kings and after they had returned from the captivity.

It is, then, from the sacred writings that we shall draw the most valuable testimony as to the ideas of the men of Tyre and Sidon on death and the life after death—ideas which must be understood before we can explain the usual methods of sepulture and the common forms of funerary architecture among these people. The ideas in question do not differ greatly from those we have already encountered in Egypt and Chaldæa. Like the Egyptians, the Phœnicians called the tomb the eternal dwelling,[1] and the most important documents they have left us are the cemeteries of Marath and Sidon.

[1] This expression is to be found in a sepulchral inscription at Malta (*Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. No. 124).

§ 2.—*The Phœnician Tomb.*

In Palestine and Phœnicia, in a country where the soil but slightly covers rock which can be readily cut with the most inferior tool, the cave must have been the first sepulchre. This is confirmed by *Genesis*. We there find that to the oldest inhabitants of Palestine a sepulchre meant a cave large enough to accommodate all the members of a single family. When Abraham lost his wife Sarah, he acquired from Ephron the Hittite, at the price of four hundred silver shekels, the cave of Macpelah, with the field which surrounded it, and all the trees in the field. There the bodies of Sarah, of the patriarch himself, of Isaac and of Jacob, were deposited.[1] At first natural caverns were used, and used in their natural state. Then art was called in to enlarge them and to make them more convenient for their purpose. The use of these caves was so thoroughly rooted in the national habits that it persisted long after men had learnt to dress and fix stone. Nearly all the Phœnician tombs are hypogea. It is quite by exception that we find a few sepulchres of a different kind, such, for example, as one of the most curious monuments at Amrit, the *Burdj-el-Bezzak* (Fig. 6). The chambers it contains, which are obviously sepulchral in character, are certainly built above the ground, but in reality it is nothing more than a transposition. The rooms are, so to speak, artificial grottoes reserved in the mass of masonry, as if the building had been modelled literally upon a natural cave (Fig. 87).[2]

Thanks to the thickness of its walls, a cavern like this kept excellent guard over its contents when once the opening had been closed by a huge stone. But men were not satisfied with having their own bodies, or those of their relations, put beyond reach of disturbance, they also wished to put something—a σῆμα as the Greeks called it—upon the tomb to keep green the memory of its occupants.[3] As soon as writing was invented an inscription was

[1] *Genesis* xxiii. xxv. xliv.

[2] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 81 and 86.

[3] Our readers will remember the expression of Homer, σῆμα χεύειν = to spread a signal, that is, to heap up earth in such a way that the site of a sepulchre should be clearly proclaimed.

the sign ; meanwhile, a mound, the trunk of a tree, an upright stone as high and heavy as possible, served the purpose. In *Genesis* we find these words : "And Rachel died and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem. And Jacob set a pillar upon her grave : that is the pillar of Rachel's grave unto this day." [1] Thus when Jacob wished to do honour to his favourite wife he was obliged to be content with raising a mass of rock on her tomb. As civilisation gradually spread over Syria from the powerful nations in her vicinity, this part of the tomb, far from disappearing, must have become of much greater importance. More exposed to destruction than the subterranean chamber, it has left but feeble



FIG. 87.—Section of the Burdj-el-Bezzak. From Renan.

traces, but still we have grounds for believing in its almost universal existence.

Whether the tomb chamber was excavated, as it was in most cases, in the depths of the soil, or whether it occupied the interior of a block of masonry, a sort of artificial rock, it was as a rule accompanied by an external and salient feature of some kind.[2] It has been suggested that this salience had an emblematic significance of a nature which to us may appear gross, but which, nevertheless, was admitted and held sacred by every antique religion as a symbol of living nature and its inexhaustible fertility.[3]

[1] *Genesis* xxxv. 19, 20. The Greek text has στήλην ἔστησε.

[2] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 75.

[3] GERHARD, *Ueber die Kunst der Phœnizier*, p. 4 and note 18 (in the *Gesammelte akademische Abhandlungen*, No. xi.).

There is one particular form of cippus which may be quoted in support of this idea, as it does, no doubt, bear a certain resemblance to a phallus; but, on the other hand, some tombs are surmounted by a pyramid (see Fig. 6), a motive which can hardly have had the significance imputed to the cone. On the whole, perhaps, it would be better to put aside all such explanations of these forms and to look upon them as dictated purely by architectonic notions.[1]

The only complete tombs yet found in Phœnicia are those which stand in that plain of Amrit, in which the Arvadites buried their dead. Our plan of a portion of that necropolis will show how the tombs were arranged in relation to each other (Fig. 88); but the largest and best preserved sepulchres, those to which



FIG. 88.—Part of the Cemetery of Amrit. From Renan.

our attention will be devoted in the first place, are situated outside this map.[2] Taking it as a whole, we find in this necropolis the characteristics of the sincerest and the most remote antiquity. In every way, therefore, it deserves to be studied first.

The tomb chambers at Amrit are higher, more spacious, and better cut than any others in Phœnicia. They are reached sometimes by a vertical well, as in Egypt, sometimes by a staircase. According to the explorers, the older tombs have a well; in a few it seems to have been replaced at a later period by steps,[3] but

[1] M. Renan will have nothing to say to Herr Gerhard's theory, which, he says, is suggested by the want of accuracy in the drawings upon which it was based.

[2] See the general map of Amrit in plate vii. of Renan's atlas.

[3] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 76.

wherever it still exists, its walls are notched at regular intervals to facilitate ascent and descent. One of these wells widens out at the bottom, giving it a kind of bottle shape.[1] Of this tomb



FIG. 89.—Tomb at Amrit. Perspective of interior. From Renan.

we give a view in perspective of the interior (Fig. 89), a plan (Fig. 90) and a section (Fig. 91).



FIGS. 90 and 91.—Tomb at Amrit. Plan and section. From Renan.

At the bottom of the well, low doorways give access to chambers varying in number according to the importance of the sepulchre. These chambers communicate one with another by doorways and flights of steps, so that those farthest from the entrance are buried

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 78, 79.

most deeply beneath the surface. There are sometimes two storeys connected by a shaft sunk from one to the other (see Figs. 92, 93).[1]

In many of the chambers the roof is flat, in others it is slightly arched; sometimes its section consists of two slight curves meeting in the centre at a very obtuse angle.[2] Every chamber in which no trace of Græco-Roman ornament is to be seen is rectangular and with one axis much longer than the other. No rule is followed in the number or arrangement of the rooms;



FIGS. 92 and 93.—Plan and section of a tomb at Amrit. From Renan.

it is easily to be seen that in many cases room was added to room as death followed death in the family to which the tomb belonged.

That these tombs were family burial-places is proved by the fact that they were all made for the reception of many occupants. The bodies were placed in niches hollowed out of the rocky walls; the dimensions of the niches, which varied very slightly, being determined by the average stature of the human body. The corpses were wrapped in shrouds; but sometimes, it appears, they were placed in wooden coffins. In the centre of the farthest wall of the principal chamber, a niche higher and wider than

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 75. [2] *Ibid.* p. 76.

the rest seems to indicate the place reserved for the head of the family.[1]

The mode of entombment here described was the most usual, but a few dish-shaped coffins of calcareous alabaster and terra-cotta have been found. They are very low and simple; they have hump-backed lids with a ridge along the middle, but with no ornament. These sarcophagi are not found in niches, but in plain chambers cut expressly for their reception. Round them on the floor a groove is cut to carry away any moisture, and thus to give the coffin a better chance of duration. The body, too, was sometimes protected against damp by being imbedded in a thick and strong envelope of plaster.[2]

As soon as it was occupied the niche was closed up with a stone slab, and when all the niches were full the door of the tomb was fortified in the same fashion. Large stones were sealed down over the mouth of the well or on the first step of the staircase.[3]

The outward appearance of tombs, especially of those of the rich, was in harmony with the elaboration of the interior; it, too, bears its testimony to the respect that was felt for the dead. The best instances of this are afforded by those monuments which the people of the country call *El awamid-el-Meghazil*, "spindle-shafts," or more briefly *El-Meghazil*, "spindles." Placed one beside the other on the apex of a mass of rocks, two of these monuments dominate all the surrounding country (Fig. 94). A short way off there is another almost equally well-preserved monument of the same class, and near that again the remains of a fourth.

"One of these monuments," says M. Renan, is "a masterpiece of proportion, elegance, and majesty,"[4] an opinion confirmed by the restoration given by M. Thobois (Fig. 95). The total height of the building is thirty-two feet. It stands upon a circular plinth, flanked by four lions, whose heads and fore-quarters alone stand out beyond its face. Above this plinth rises a cylinder crowned by a hemisphere. The whole—except the plinth, which consists of four blocks—being cut from a single huge stone. The double cylinder is decorated round the summit of each of its parts with a row of carved crenellations standing out about four inches from the general surface. We have already referred to the Assyrian origin of this motive. The dressing of the stone and the execution of these

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 76.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 78.
[3] *Ibid.* pp. 77, 78.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 72.



FIG. 94.—The Meghazils of Amrit. Actual state. From Renan.

mouldings is very careful; on the other hand, the four lions seem to have been left unfinished; their hasty execution is in strong contrast with the careful workmanship of the architecture. Perhaps, however, their comparative roughness may have been intended to add to their effect when seen from a distance. The tomb chamber



FIG. 95.—Tomb at Amrit. Restoration in perspective. From Renan.

beneath is reached by a flight of fifteen steps. We give a plan and section of it in Figs. 96 and 97.[1]

The design of the monument which stands at a distance of about twenty feet from that just described is less happy (Fig. 93).[2] It is

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 71-73, and plates xi., xii., xiii.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 73, and plates xi. and xii.

composed, first, of a cubical block with a salient band at top and bottom; secondly, of a monolithic cylinder about thirteen feet high and twelve feet in diameter; thirdly, of a five-faced pyramidion. The base is rough, the stone apparently left as it came from the quarry, and the work as a whole looks unfinished.

The faces of the plinth of the second monument are parallel to those of the first. The chambers they cover also lie in one direction. It would seem, therefore, that the two monuments were made at the same time, and that one is a pendant to the other. They rise high above a large inclosure hollowed out of the rock about fifty feet to the south. The ruins of various buildings are



Figs. 96 and 97.—Plan and section of tomb at Amrit. From Renan.

sprinkled about this inclosure, among them, those of a thick wall built of large stones, traces of which are also to be found westwards at the foot of the rock upon which stand the two tombs. To the north-west of these same tombs, there are some rock-cut chambers. The whole may perhaps have formed the burial-place of some important section of the population.

The third of the better-preserved monuments is much simpler than the other two.[1] Its chief feature is a monolith resting upon a double-stepped base; it terminates in a moulding composed of a cyma recta and a fillet, above this rises a block squared

[1] *Ibid.* p. 74 and plate 17.

below and shaped like a truncated pyramid above. At present the whole erection is about thirteen feet high. It is more than



FIG. 98.—Tomb at Amrit restored. From Renan.

probable that the pyramid was originally complete, as we see it in the restoration of M. Thobois (Fig. 98). The peculiarity of this tomb lies in the fact that the entrance to the staircase is



FIG. 99.—Longitudinal section of tomb at Amrit. From Renan.

covered by a ridge roof, cut from a single block and supported laterally by a course of huge stones (Fig. 99).

Of the fourth monument nothing remains but two blocks which seem to have belonged to a kind of obelisk the rest of which has disappeared. There are no signs of any plinth.[1]

Finally, the *Burdj-el-Bezzak*, of which we have already had occasion to speak, is also crowned by a pyramid (Figs. 6 and 87).[2] We have already explained that it is distinguished from other Arvadite tombs by the fact that it is not built, like them, on the top of a chamber. Its blocks have been shaken and displaced by earthquakes; the soldiers and brigands who have inhabited it at various times, have done much to hasten its ruin, and yet it is still the most important and the best preserved building that has come down to us from ancient Phœnicia, for the other tombs at Amrit are little more than monoliths. Its present aspect is that of a cubical mass of masonry built with horizontal courses and vertical joints; the stones are more than sixteen feet long, and are laid without cement. On exploring the heap of debris gathered at its foot, it was discovered that this tomb was originally surmounted by a pyramid, of which nearly all the materials were found. It is likely that when the building was turned into a fortalice the pyramid was demolished for the sake of obtaining a flat roof, which would be useful for defence. The tomb as it stands is thirty-seven feet high. Judging from the angle of the facing stones the crowning pyramid must have been a little more than sixteen feet high. Its former appearance may be gathered from M. Thobois's restoration (Fig. 6); its present state is shown in Fig. 87.

In the interior there are two chambers, one above the other, and each opening to the outer air by a narrow door, or rather window. On their walls there are marks where the partitions between the niches have been torn away. It is difficult now to decide whether these partitions were attached after the tomb was finished, or whether they formed an integral part of the stones of which it was composed. In any case, both chambers were honeycombed with niches, the upper one having twelve (Fig. 100) and the lower three.

Our view of the lower chamber (Fig. 101) shows a hole like the opening of a sepulchral pit in the middle of the floor. This was made, however, by the workmen of Dr. Gaillardot, one of the

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 80-90.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 75.

assistants of M. Renan.[1] Several blocks of stone were here removed, and the wet mud on which the floor rests was reached. So that it appears certain that the monument stands upon the sand, and does not, like its neighbours, cover a subterranean chamber. It forms, therefore, a unique variation upon the type of Phœnician tomb we



FIG. 100.—The Burdj-el-Bezzak. Upper chamber. From Renan.

have described above, a type we shall encounter in other cemeteries besides that of Arvad.

The next most important necropolis in Syria is that of Sidon. The most curious discoveries have been made in it. As might be guessed, it is larger than the cemetery of Arvad. Sidon and its suburbs were far richer and more populous than the



FIG. 101.—The Burdj-el-Bezzak. Lower chamber. From Renan.

group of cities of which Arvad was the head. If, in spite of its wide extent, this cemetery is hardly so interesting to the archæologist as that of Amrit, it is because none of its tombs have preserved their upper members—the part that rose above the

[1] *Mission*, p. 87.

soil and represented the primitive cippus. Saida has never ceased to be a town with several thousands of inhabitants; and by them the stones of the visible monuments have been carried off and used for their own purposes.[1]

The necropolis of Sidon was cut in a bed of calcareous rocks, which stand but slightly above the plane.[2] The arrangement of its tombs was like that of Amrit, according to Gaillardot, who spent several years in exploring this cemetery. The features by which the most ancient sepulchres may be distinguished from those of the Greek and Roman period are these: by vertical wells, rectangular on plan, cut in the living rock; at the bottom of these



FIG. 102.—Section of a tomb at Sidon. From Renan.

wells one of the short sides, and sometimes both, is pierced by a square doorway giving access to the tomb chamber (Fig. 102).[3] This doorway was kept walled up, and was opened only for burials. The wells themselves were closed sometimes by slabs placed athwart the opening below the layer of vegetable earth with which the rock was covered (Fig. 103), sometimes lower down,

[1] The summit of the mass of rock which incloses the great chamber called *Mugharet-Abloun*, is carefully planed, as if to receive a pyramidal structure (RENAN, *Mission*, p. 477).

[2] See plate lxii. of M. Renan's work. It gives a detailed plan of this cemetery.

[3] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 481.

just above the walled-up door of the coffin chamber (Fig. 104). In the first case the wells are, of course, found empty, but as a rule they are filled with earth. They had apparently to be cleared every time a burial took place.[1]

Compared to those of Egypt, these Sidonian pits are shallow, because the stratum of rock in which they are excavated has an average thickness of hardly more than thirty feet, while it rests upon sand impregnated with sea water. Sometimes, as at Amrit, a tomb has been re-arranged and a flight of steps added (Fig. 105).

These tombs have neither sarcophagi nor niches. In some the dead are placed on the floor of the chamber, in others arranged in



FIGS. 103 and 104.—Wells in a tomb at Sidon. From Renan.
a. Vegetable earth. *b*. Door of tomb chamber. *c*. Well. *d*. Slab. *e*. Sand.

large and carefully-excavated graves. In both cases they rested upon beds of sand, the pelvis raised ten or twelve inches above the head and feet by a little heap of pebbles carefully arranged.

Next come the tombs in which the chamber is surrounded by niches for coffins, and those in which the more important people, the heads of the family perhaps, repose in sarcophagi placed in graves cut in the floor of the sepulchre.[2] The fine series of anthropoid sarcophagi in the Louvre was found in tombs of this kind. Judging from the style of the heads on these marble coffins, we are inclined to ascribe the oldest among them to the

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 496, 497.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 482.

time of the Persian domination, while the most recent may date from the Seleucidæ.

Lastly, to the Græco-Roman period belong a large number of sepulchres that were made or enlarged at the expense of others of much earlier date. These are always reached by flights of steps. Their chambers are very large and pierced with recesses in which many sarcophagi have been found, whose approximate date is given by the style of their ornamentation. All doubt on this point is removed by the style of the paintings on the stuccoed walls, and by the fragmentary inscriptions which are still to be found at many points.



FIG. 105.—Longitudinal section of a tomb at Sidon. From Renan.

The tomb of Esmounazar deserves to be specially studied, both for its arrangement and on account of the peculiar form of the sarcophagus it inclosed. And first I must draw attention to the plan of that part of the necropolis in which the king's sepulchre was placed (Fig. 106). The sections through the lines A, B, C; D, E; N, M; and K, L (Figs. 107-110), give even a better idea than the plan of the aspect and formation of the ground. A salient mass of rock has been excavated in such a way as to accommodate several burial-places. Those to which the attention of explorers was first called were found arranged round a large chamber known as the *Mugharet-Abloun*, or "grotto of Apollo" (R),

where there were also several graves excavated through the floor.[1] In this chamber the fragments of one of the most interesting of



FIG. 106.—Plan of a portion of the necropolis of Sidon (Mugharet-Abloun). From Renan.

the anthropoid sarcophagi were collected. It was broken into so many pieces that it has been found impossible to restore it (S).[2]



FIG. 107.—Section through line A, B, C, of Fig 106. From Renan.

By the side of this chamber a well descended entirely through the mass of rock and tapped the water beneath (Y); it was used,

[1] Upon the arrangement of this chamber and the discoveries made in it, see M. GAILLARDOT'S *Journal des Fouilles* (*Mission*, pp. 436-440.)

[2] It is now in the Louvre.

perhaps, in the ceremonies which accompanied the introduction of a body into the tomb.

To the north-east of the rock in which this great chamber was excavated, the tomb of Esmounazar, King of Sidon, was discovered in 1856. A sketch made on the spot by M. de Vogüé, and here presented in the form of a section, will serve to show



FIG. 108.—Section through D, E.

the arrangement of the parts (Fig. 111).[1] The sarcophagus which had already been removed from the monument when his sketch was taken, is here restored to its place.

"The sarcophagus is a ponderous coffin of black amphibolite; it is composed of two pieces, a body and a lid (Fig. 86). It rested in a grave measuring ten feet by five, excavated in the



FIG. 109.—Section through N, M.

FIG. 110.—Section through K, L.

living rock. Hollows cut in the floor of the grave permitted the ropes to be withdrawn with which the sarcophagus was lowered,

[1] DE VOGÜÉ, *Note sur la Forme du Tombeau d'Echmounazar* (*Journal Asiatique*, 1880, pp. 278-286). For a history of the discovery and an account of the works dealing with this precious monument, see the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. No. 3.

while a ledge (F), some three feet eight inches from the top, supported, no doubt, a heavy lid, an arrangement often encountered in the necropolis of Sidon. In most of the tombs in the neighbourhood, however, the graves opened into rock-cut sepulchral chambers, while that of Esmounazar, excavated at the extreme edge of a rocky mass, was not subterranean, and before it could have arrangements like those of the hypogea about it, it had to be completed by external constructions. In order to provide a sure foundation for these, the rock was levelled at the top and all its salient parts cut into convenient shapes. The shape to which the rock was thus reduced may be seen in our wood-cut (Fig. 111). The lower blocks of the upper building rested on these step-like surfaces; they have now all disappeared, with the exception of three in the angle on the left marked V, v. One of these stones



FIG. 111.—Tomb of Esmounazar. Section through chamber and structures adjoining. From De Vogüé.

is bevelled (v), and in this it corresponds with the rock at the opposite angle. This suggests that from these two sloping surfaces an arch sprang originally and made the small chamber a kind of artificial hypogeum. At s there is a groove in the rock like the threshold of a small door, the architrave of which must have been built into the neighbouring hollow.

"To sum up, the body reposed in a sarcophagus, which again was inclosed in a grave covered by a small vaulted apartment; the whole was prefaced by a court excavated in the rock. It is probable that a pavilion of some kind rose above the tomb, but no trace of it can now be found."[1]

After carefully examining all the material evidence, M. de

[1] DE VOGÜÉ, *Note sur la Forme du Tombeau d'Echmounazar.* M. GAILLARDOT also believes in the existence of a pavilion (*Mission*, p. 342).

Vogüé sought for additional information in the terms of the inscription, and at last was enabled to compile the restoration, some idea of which is afforded by our section (Fig. 112).[1] The built portion may readily be distinguished from that which is native rock by a difference in the shading.

We now know that the tomb of Esmounazar is much less ancient than it was once thought to be. Its comparative lateness was suspected as soon as the necropolis had been more thoroughly explored and a relative date assigned to the tombs. None of the characteristics of the oldest tombs are to be found in it. There is no well, no chamber hollowed in the depths of the rock; the king rests upon the surface of the soil, in a chamber with a built vault. The conclusion to which these facts pointed was confirmed by an



FIG. 112.—Section of the tomb of Esmounazar restored. From De Vogüé.

examination of the sarcophagus. This was certainly not made in Phœnicia, where they possessed neither the very hard rock of which it is composed nor the skill to cut it. It must, in fact, have been imported from Egypt, and perhaps Esmounazar may not even have been its first proprietor. Upon that part of the lid

[1] M. DE VOGÜÉ gives the following translation of those passages in the inscription which, in his opinion, confirm his restoration: Lines 3-6, "I repose in this stone coffin, in this grave in this monument which I have built. I conjure all men, be they of royal or common blood, not to open my sarcophagus nor to look for treasure about me, for there is no treasure about me; (I conjure them) not to remove my sarcophagus, and not to load me (as I lie) in my sarcophagus with the vault of a second grave." Lines 7, 8, "Any man who opens the vault of this sarcophagus or who carries off my sarcophagus, or builds above me in my sarcophagus." Line 10, "The man who shall open the vault of this sarcophagus or shall take away this stone coffin . . . ." Lines 20, 21, "I conjure all men not to open my vault, not to destroy my vault, not to build above my sarcophagus, nor to carry it away."

which now bears the chief inscription the surface is slightly depressed, and Mariette was inclined to think that this gentle hollow occupied the place of a hieroglyphic inscription, which had been effaced by the polisher to make way for a new epitaph.[1] However this may be, whether Esmounazar was content with a ready-made sarcophagus, or whether he commissioned one for himself, the fact remains that Mariette, whose experience in such matters was very great, declared that this coffin could not be older than the time of Psammeticus. He had never found anything of the kind in Upper Egypt; the quarries from which the rock was taken, those of Hammamat, on the way from Kaneh to Kosseyr, were not opened till towards the end of the twenty-sixth dynasty. It was about the same time that sarcophagi of this pattern first appeared, and under the following dynasties they became more and more common, down even to the period of the Greek conquest. We are thus led to believe that Esmounazar must have reigned towards the beginning of the fourth century B.C., an idea which is in complete harmony with the text of his epitaph.[2] We thus find ourselves brought very near the hour when Greek art was to triumph in Phœnicia as over the rest of the Levant, and yet we find a prince of Sidon turning to Egypt for the couch on which he was to sink into his final sleep.

At the end of his elaborate study of the tombs near Sidon, M. Renan confesses that in spite of his own care and the zeal of his devoted and intelligent collaborator, M. Gaillardot, none of the tombs he cleared or objects he found in them belonged, except in a very few instances, to a period anterior to the Assyrian domination, and that most of them dated from the time of the Achæmenids. The cemetery he explored so conscientiously seemed to him very small to have sufficed, during many centuries, for a town so rich and so thickly peopled as Sidon, and he asks himself whether his successors have not yet to find the necropolis of the early founders of the Phœnician power, of those hardy navigators who were the first to explore the western seas.[3]

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 414, No. 3.

[2] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. p. 20. M. Clermont-Ganneau is ready to believe that the "Master of Kings" mentioned in this inscription—he who, in reward for services rendered, gave over Dora and Joppa to Esmounazar—was no other than Alexander. In that case the tomb would only date from the last years of the fourth century before our era.

[3] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 503, 504.

In the neighbourhood of Tyre, still greater disappointment awaits the explorer. There are traces everywhere of sepulchral excavations in the rocks that rise above the narrow band of sea-washed plain; but in nearly every case the slight consistency of the rock has caused the roofs to fall in. In the few cases in which a tomb has been found in fair condition there are neither inscriptions nor mouldings nor anything else to indicate its date. Sarcophagi, graves, niches, all have been gutted many centuries ago. Nothing more naked and bare than these tombs could be imagined.[1]

The only monument in the whole of this district that greatly excites our curiosity is that known as the *Kabr-Hiram*, or "tomb of Hiram" (Fig. 113). This denomination, which is quite recent, has no value; no importance whatever must be attached to it, while a study of the building itself yields no evidence as to its date. There is no inscription either on the building itself, or in the chamber attached to it; there is nothing in fact to give a hint of a plausible solution. In the chamber there is neither niche nor grave, there is nothing in fact to suggest a sepulchre; besides which the chamber does not seem to have been excavated at the time the monument was built; they agree ill together and do not seem to be parts of the same *ensemble*.[2] However this may be, the appearance of the building recalls that of the great tombs at Amrit. The lower part consists of a square base, ending in a cornice which separates it from an upper story slightly pyramidal in shape. But the latter is not a pyramid; it is a huge sarcophagus in two pieces, the body and the lid. The total elevation of the building, measured from the bottom of the first course, is a little more than twenty feet. The want of regularity, which is taken to be one of the signs by which one may recognize works dating from the earliest Phœnician antiquity is here conspicuous.[3] At a distance the monument is not without effect; it imposes by its mass. But on a close examination we find that the pyramidal shape is not well obtained, and that one side is nearly perpendicular. The faces do not correspond. On those turned towards the road, the stone is carefully worked and dressed, on the others it is almost in its natural state. Taking it all in all we are inclined to

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 589.
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 599-602, and plates xlvii., xlviii.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 829.



FIG. 113.—The "Tomb of Hiram." From Renan.

think that the pretended tomb of Hiram, even if it does not date from Solomon's famous contemporary, must nevertheless be ascribed to a period earlier than that of the Greeks and Romans.

The necropolis of Adloun, between Tyre and Sidon, attracts the attention of the traveller by the isolation of the rocky mass in which the tombs are cut, at the edge of the road which runs along the sea (Fig. 114); but the chambers are small, narrow, and low; there is only room in each for about three corpses.[1] It is the burial-place belonging to the small neighbouring city. Vaults and arches, which in Phœnicia are a sign of comparative lateness,



FIG. 114.—Necropolis of Adloun. From Lortet.

continually occur in it. Doorways, with arches springing direct from their thresholds, and benches within, hollowed out like troughs and covered, as in the Roman catacombs, with an arcosolium, betray the Græco-Roman epoch. Many of the chambers are even decorated with paintings in which Christian emblems may be recognized.

At Gebal and in its neighbourhood there are, on the other hand, hypogea whose number and size bear witness to the importance of

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 656-661. The interest and importance of this necropolis has been much exaggerated (DE BERTON, *Essai sur la Topographie de Tyre*, p. 85. *Revue Archéologique*, 1834, pp. 18 *et seq.*)

the town to which they belonged. The Giblite sepulchres are mainly distinguished from those of Arvad and Sidon by having their openings in the vertical faces or slopes of the rocks in which they are cut; they are not very deep, and, being without either well or pit, are entered on the level.[1] The doorway is sometimes ornamented, but always very simply. Thus one example which is believed to be very ancient, has above its entrance a small triangular pediment with a sculptured rosette in the middle (Fig. 115).[2]

Some of these tombs have a character of grand and primitive simplicity. In their interiors neither ornaments nor mouldings, but spacious recesses cut symmetrically in the living rock, are to be found (Fig. 116). In one or two cases they are even natural grottoes, in the floor of which huge troughs have been excavated, and afterwards closed by thick slabs. These slabs are prisms of stone, triangular sometimes, but as a rule quadrangular; they are always roughly blocked out, and without inscription or device of any kind. The troughs are filled with water that creeps through the pores of wall and ceiling. "I know nothing more impressive," says M. Renan, "than these solitary grottoes where the sound of falling drops of water alone breaks in upon the silence, and where the slow industry of the stalactites obscures the ruin of the centuries. I recommend a visit to these grottoes to painters of sacred history who go to the East for inspiration. Few places are more picturesque. These tombs are fit for heroes, for the heroes of Homer or the giants of early Hebrew legend."[3]

It is chiefly in the necropolis of Gebal that a feature is to be noticed which we encounter elsewhere in the cemeteries of Phœnicia, but more rarely.[4] If we enter one of the chambers of which we have been speaking, we shall find almost always that the ceiling is pierced with a number of round holes. Sometimes these holes are so close together that they make the ceiling look like a sieve. They are air holes, drilled through the whole thickness of the rock. The inner face of these little shafts is either smooth or marked with horizontal scratches. The perforation has been carried out with the auger. The average diameter of these shafts is ten inches. They widen out into a trumpet mouth as they approach the outer air. At first it was thought that they really

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 206.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 205.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 204.
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 194-198.



FIG. 115.—Entrance to a Giblite tomb. From Renan.

were air-holes, but when the surface of the rock all round Gebal was explored, it was found that the shafts often occurred where no hypogeum was known to exist. The most obvious idea to strike the explorers was that the rock was hollowed beneath into vast catacombs, whose entrances had been so well concealed that it had escaped all their researches, and the best way to vertify their conjecture seemed to be to descend into the supposed hypogea by the air-holes themselves. This was tried at various points. The shafts were enlarged and workmen lowered down them, but not a single new tomb was discovered. At fifteen, twenty, or five-and-twenty feet, as the case might be, the shafts suddenly grew narrower and ended in a *cul-de-sac*, as if at about that distance the instrument used lost its force and had to stop. The only possible



FIG. 116.—Interior of a Giblite tomb. From Renan.

explanation seemed to be that before sepulchral excavations were begun, trials were made of the quality and homogeneity of the rock so as to have some fore-knowledge of the difficulties to be overcome. And this hypothesis is decisively confirmed by an examination of those chambers in which the ceiling is thus pierced. The holes do not all end in the ceiling. Some of them run down the walls in a way that makes them quite useless; some cut into the jambs of the door, others are sunk close to the chamber without actually touching it. Now and then we find a shaft so long that the end of it appears in the floor. It is evident, therefore, that these shafts are preparatory soundings, made before the actual cutting of the chamber was begun. If any more evidence were required to prove that they had nothing to do with supplying light or air, it would be given by the fact that those shafts which

end in a tomb-chamber were always found blocked up by large stones to prevent the earth falling into the tomb, or mischievous people from throwing things down the shaft.

The accompanying diagram (Fig. 117) was prepared for the illustration of M. Renan's observations upon these shafts. It does not reproduce any particular tomb, but the peculiarities found in different parts of the Giblite necropolis are united in it. No instance of this curious habit is to be found outside Phœnicia, where, moreover, it is a specially Giblite custom. We have no reason to suppose that it dates from a very remote epoch. These tubes are not to be found in the oldest hypogea; at Saïda the tombs in which they occur are not among the more archaic.

We may conclude this part of our inquiry with M. Renan's statement of the conclusions to which he was brought by his study



FIG. 117.—Section showing the soundings in the Giblite tombs. From Renan.

of the cemeteries of Amrit and Saïda:[1]—"There can be no doubt but that the rectangular grottoes with wells are the most ancient. The arrangements of the wells and the way in which they open laterally into the coffin-chambers are quite Egyptian. In these the antique notion of a tomb appears in all its grandeur. There is no ostentation; no wish to impress the passing stranger; the one thought is to honour the dead as if he were still alive. The prevalence of horizontal lines and the absence of all Greek or Roman influence, the extreme simplicity of the plan, the indifference to small details and to all that has to do with convenience, finally, and above all, the rigorous agreement between the character of these tombs and the Biblical metaphors, are so many features all pointing to the same conclusion, namely, that they

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 75 and 416.

are the oldest of the Phœnician graves. The well into which the corpse was lowered, the gaping mouth that appeared ever to beg for more, was that mouth of the *sheol* (*os putei*) which gave rise to the favourite image of the Hebrews, 'The mouth of the grave hath devoured him.' So, too, for the Arvadite *meghazils;* those were the *horaboth*, or pyramids, which the richer men caused to be raised upon their tombs in the time of Job, to the indignation of that proud nomad.[1]

§ 3.—*Sarcophagi and Sepulchral Furniture.*

We have now studied the general arrangements of Phœnician sepulchres, and shown that, although between one town and another they presented certain differences, their ruling principle was always the same; all over the country, at Arvad as at Tyre, the tomb was a cavern or pit cut in the living rock. We have yet, however, to follow the corpse into its grave, to inquire what changes took place in the mode of sepulture as the centuries passed on, and of what the furniture with which the piety of the living filled the chamber of the dead consisted.

In the first, the most remote, antiquity, the body was wrapped in a shroud and placed in a cave. In later times, when the use of tools had been learnt, niches were hollowed out in the natural walls of the grotto, or pits dug through its floor; sometimes these pits were dug in the open air on the rocky platforms above the slopes on which the hypogea opened (Fig. 118). But in time a race like the Phœnicians, whose intercourse with Egypt was so intimate, were sure to learn how to give their dead an extra guarantee of duration, in the form either of one of those stone chests which we call sarcophagi, or of a cedar coffin held together and fortified by strong metal clasps.

The simplest sarcophagi are no more than huge stone boxes with lids rising into a ridge in the centre. One of these is seen in our Fig. 119, which represents a tomb excavated by M. Renan at Gebal. Above and beyond it another but much more ornamental specimen of the same class appears. As time went on, the

[1] JOB iii. 14; xxi. 32. As to the sense in which M. RENAN interprets the word *horaboth*, see his *Histoire générale des Langues sémitiques*, p. 204, third edition.

forms of these sarcophagi became more complex. At Oum-el-Awamid one has been found with acroteria at each of its four angles and at the summit of the small pediment formed by the ends of its triangular lid (Fig. 120).[1] The interest of this monument is enhanced by the small altar which appears in the centre of one end; it is designed on the same lines as the sarcophagus itself. Altars like these are not rare in the Tyrian country. They were, no doubt, both emblems of the worship paid by a family to its dead, and instruments by which the rites were performed. In all probability, the little cippi with egg-shaped



FIG. 118.—Graves dug in the rock at Gebal. From Renan.

summits which have been found in the necropolis of Sidon served a purpose of the same kind; they were most likely erected either on the top of sepulchres or in front of their entrances (Fig. 121).

The ornamentation of the trough-like sandstone coffins, which are found in considerable quantities in the necropolis of Sidon, is also of the most rudimentary kind (Fig. 122), but, nevertheless, a few of them have been found marked with Greek letters, which, unless they have been added afterwards, point to a late period of the decadence.[2] This seems to show that these patterns escaped from the influence of fashion by their very simplicity; invented

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 706, 707.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 504.

early, they seem to have preserved their vogue more or less down to the very last years of the antique civilization, so that they are, in themselves, insufficient to give a date to a sepulchre. But the case is different when we encounter sarcophagi decorated with



FIG. 119.—Two Giblite sarcophagi. From Renan.

lions' heads or ox-skulls united by heavy garlands.[1] The execution of these matters is heavy, belonging, in fact, to provincial Roman art. Another kind of coffin, dating from the same period

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 411 and 422, and plate xlv. fig. 1; plate lx. Several of these are in the Louvre.

of the decadence, is the leaden sarcophagus which is found chiefly in the necropolis of Sidon.[1] It is made up of leaden plates cast



FIG. 120.—Sarcophagus from Oum-el-Awamid. From Renan.

in a mould and then soldered one to another (Fig. 123). The myth of Psyche is very often represented on these leaden coffins,

FIG. 121.—Cippus from Sidon. Height 14 inches. From Renan.

which are to be found, so far as we know, only in Phœnicia. In

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 427, and plate lx. fig. 1.

the same necropolis pieces of coffins in terra-cotta are often encountered;[1] being so easily broken, they have in most cases been reduced to fragments by the treasure-hunters.

The monuments to which it is possible to give at least an approximate date are the sarcophagi called by M. Renan *anthropoid*, after the expression made use of by Herodotus when he speaks of the Egyptian mummy-cases.[2] Like the leaden coffins,



FIG. 122.—Sandstone coffin. From Renan.

these anthropoid sarcophagi are peculiar to Phœnicia. With a single exception, that of Tyre, every necropolis in Phœnicia has furnished examples of them.[3]

In the sarcophagus of Esmounazar both material and workmanship are Egyptian (Fig. 86). It was, in fact, imported into Syria, where nothing was added to it but the long inscription, in



FIG. 123.—Leaden coffin. From Lortet.

which, however, most of its value consists. But the anthropoid sarcophagi belong to Phœnician art. Their form is the result of one of those efforts of adaptation which were characteristic of the

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 496.

[2] Σύλινον τύπον ἀνθρωποειδέα.—HERODOTUS, ii. 86.

[3] See RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 403-405 and 412-427, plates lix. and lx. Cf. LONGPERIER, *Musée Napoléon III.*, notices of plates xvi. and xvii.

clever, rather than inventive, artists of Phœnicia. It was certainly suggested by the shape of the wooden mummy-cases with which her merchants were so familiar in the land of the Pharaohs. We are sure of this, not only because the coffin is made to follow the general lines of the body, or because there is anything improbable in two races having independently determined to figure the dead man couched on the lid of his tomb; but because the Egyptian convention which represents the head and neck of the dead man on the lid of his sarcophagus while all the rest of him is left in a state of abstraction is followed. The peculiar physiognomy given by a custom like this to a mummy-case is to be found in these Phœnician sarcophagi and nowhere else out



FIG. 124.—Sarcophagus of Sidon. Louvre.

of Egypt. Equally significant is the fact that as the wooden coffins of Egypt were decorated with brilliant colours so were these stone receptacles. All those who have had the chance of seeing any of them before they were disturbed, or soon afterwards, are unanimous in declaring that the traces of colour were still very marked. On the hair dark blue and red have been distinguished; the latter colour spreading even over part of the face. The body of a sarcophagus of this kind which was found in 1725, near Palermo, was ornamented round its sides with pictures in panels (Fig. 125); the colouring substances stained the hands of those who touched it.[1] When they were new these

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 416. DE LONGPERIER, *Musée Napoléon III.*, description of plate xvii. In the Phœnician cemetery at Cagliari, in Sardinia, where the dead

sarcophagi with their brilliant colours must have looked very like the Egyptian mummy-cases ; perhaps, as in Egypt, the lips and hair were gilded. The resemblance between the two kinds of coffins is completed by the salience at the lower extremity of the lid, corresponding to the feet (Fig. 126). That mummy-cases should have been finished off in this way was natural enough. They were light and movable, and in certain cases were set upright against a wall,[1] and the enlarged foot was given to add to their stability. But in the heavy stone envelopes of Phœnicia there was no such necessity ; they were intended to lie on their backs as they have been found in all those tombs—at *Mugharet-Abloun* for instance—in which they had preserved their proper places. This appendix is, therefore, quite useless in the Phœnician coffins ;



FIG. 125.—Coffin of painted stone from an old drawing. From D'Orville.[3]

it is the literal reproduction of a detail which had a *raison d'être* in the model, but has none in the copy.

Whether, then, we look at the general idea, at the accidental forms, or at the external decoration of these sarcophagi, we are

were buried in wooden coffins, it has been ascertained that when those coffins were first discovered their surfaces showed clear signs of having once been painted. On one of them bands of red, blue, white, and green were clearly discernible (FR. ELENA, *Scavi nella necropoli occidentale di Cagliari*, Cagliari, 1868, 4to, p. 19).

[1] In the Egyptian tombs the mummies have always been found lying down, but in the funerary ceremonies they were, during the celebration of certain rites, set up on end. This we know from a large number of pictures and reliefs (WILKINSON, *Ancient Egyptians*, second edition, vol. iii. cap. xvi. figs. 624-626, plates xvii. and lxviii., &c.). The Greeks and Romans were mistaken in supposing that the mummies were set up in the tomb in a vertical position (HERODOTUS, ii. 86 ; DIODORUS, i. xcii. ; SILIUS ITALICUS, xiii. v. 474-476).

[2] *Journal des Fouilles* of GAILLARDOT, in RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 434 and 435.

[3] *Sicula*, vol. i. plate B, p. 43.

always brought to the same result; everything tells us of a borrowing from Egypt by Phœnicia. Must we conclude from this that the borrowing took place at a very remote period, during the early days of the commerce between the towns on the Syrian



FIG. 126.—Sarcophagus of Sidon. Louvre.

coast and those of the Delta? Certainly not. Egypt furnished the primitive elements of the type, but it is not the influence of Egypt that we find in the execution. There is but one of these anthropoid coffins in which the arrangement of the headdress is

FIG. 127.—Head from an anthropoid sarcophagus of Sidon. Louvre.

Egyptian, and even there the profile is quite Greek in its elegance (Fig. 127). In the whole range of Egyptian art there is nothing in the least like the symmetrical curls of these Phœnician heads, which remind us at first sight of Assyrian sculpture (Fig. 128);

but if we look more closely we shall find still stronger points of likeness to the work of Greek artists. In the example which we incline to believe is the oldest of them all (Fig. 128), the undulating masses of hair are chiselled, and the planes of the face established with a skill that could never have been learnt in the school of Assyria. If we attempt, like M. Renan, to class these monuments chronologically according to their workmanship, we find the heads becoming ever more and more Hellenic at the same time as the shape of the coffin-lid was steadily modified. In the example which appears the most modern of all, judging from the arrangement of the hair and the characteristics of its style as a



FIG. 128.—Sarcophagus from Sidon. Length 7 feet 1 inch.

whole, the head belongs to a type which is commonly supposed to have been created by Lysippus, the type of the Apollo Belvedere (Fig. 129). Moreover, this head, instead of being buried, and, as it were, lost in the mass of the sarcophagus, is almost "in the round," while the receptacle itself has become nearly rectangular, and has lost most of the peculiar features of the primitive type. We have, in fact, arrived at the last member of the series.

How long a time must we suppose this series of remains to have covered? We admit willingly that they go back as far as the reigns of the first Seleucids, to the third century before our era, but we are not inclined to believe that any of them date from

the period of Assyrian supremacy.[1] In our opinion none of these anthropoid sarcophagi are older than the sixth century B.C.; most of them belong to the period between the reign of Cyrus and the battle of Arbela, an epoch of singular prosperity for Phœnicia; finally, a few among them are posterior to the Macedonian conquest. We have encountered none that suggest the Roman period, and we are, moreover, confirmed in our belief that the fashion of these sarcophagi did not persist beyond the limits we have assigned to them by the well-ascertained fact that, so far at least as the necropolis of Sidon is concerned, every sarcophagus of the kind which has been recovered, whether intact or in a



FIG. 129.—Sarcophagus from Sidon. Louvre.

thousand pieces, has been found in the tombs with rectangular wells and no staircases, that is to say, in sepulchres which, without dating from the earliest ages, are yet of a very respectable antiquity.[2]

[1] "Our sarcophagi," says M. Renan, "cover, in my opinion, a very wide extent of time, and give us examples of Phœnician art from about 800 or 900 to about 200 B.C." (*Mission*, p. 421). We agree with M. Renan only when he allows that the great majority of these monuments belong to the period in which, in our belief, they were all manufactured. M. Heuzey is quite of our opinion; in fact, he even goes farther; he thinks the oldest of these sculptures does not date from a period anterior to the fifth century (*Catalogue des Figurines en Terre cuite du Musée du Louvre*, p. 85).

[2] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 422.

As the general forms of these coffins were borrowed from Egypt and the minor characteristics of their style from Greece, so their material too was brought from abroad. They were objects of luxury to be acquired only by the rich, and when the latter gave a commission to the sculptor for a sarcophagus on which their own features were to be carried down to posterity, they naturally wished that it should be executed in some material which should allow the artist to make use of his talent to the best advantage. The limestone of the country did not lend itself kindly to the chisel, and the custom arose of going abroad in search of a rock of finer and firmer grain.[1] Nearly all the anthropoid sarcophagi hitherto discovered are made of a marble which is not to be found in Syria; it was brought, in all probability, from those Grecian islands with which the Phœnicians had such a close and long-standing connection. One of the few exceptions to which we need allude is a sarcophagus with a head sculptured upon it, the material of which is brown lava from Safita. It was found by M. Renan in the necropolis of Arvad, and sent home to the Louvre.[2] A few, too, were made of terra-cotta, for those no doubt to whom economy was a consideration. Of one of these the Louvre possesses the upper parts (Fig. 130). It comes from Amrit, in Northern Phœnicia.[3]

But whatever their material, all these anthropoid sarcophagi were made in Phœnicia. The coffin of Esmounazar is, indeed, Egyptian in workmanship, and many sarcophagi have been found in the necropolis of Memphis which may be called its brothers;[4] but it is otherwise with the rest of these sculptured chests. In the Boulak Museum there are, no doubt, some twenty marble coffins, dating from the Greek or Persian epochs, which might be compared to our Phœnician sarcophagi; but the resemblance is more apparent than real. The sarcophagi of Phœnicia are large and deep troughs; those of Egypt are simply mummy-boxes cut in stone instead of being built up of wood or *cartonnage*. They were meant to be placed in an outer case of stone, granite, or basalt, similar to that of Esmounazar (Fig. 131).[5]

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 426. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 45, 46, and plate vi.

[3] This discovery is described by M. RENAN in a paper entitled: "*Un Masque en terre cuite recemment acquis par la Musée du Louvre*" (*Revue archéologique*, 2nd series, vol. xxxvi. pp. 73, 74, and plate xvi.

[4] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 413. [5] *Ibid.* p. 414, note 4.

Other indications point to the same conclusion. One of the anthropoid sarcophagi in the Louvre, that which comes from Byblos, is marked with a Phœnician letter on its shoulder; still more decisive is the existence of the Tortosa coffin in brown lava, that is to say, in the material of the country: we may draw the same conclusion from the fragmentary head in terra-cotta figured on this page (Fig. 130). In its general appearance the influence of archaic Greek art can be clearly traced, but some of its details are quite local in character, especially the corkscrew curl at the side of the cheek, the earrings in the shape of a broken circle,

FIG. 130.—Fragment of an anthropoid sarcophagus in terra-cotta. Louvre.

and the rings along the top edge of the ears. All these details belong to the costume of an Arvadite woman of about the time of Cyrus.

It is clear, then, that these sarcophagi are a product of Phœnician industry; if any further evidence were necessary, it would be found in the fact, that, whenever they have been encountered outside the frontiers of Phœnicia proper, it has always been at some point where the Phœnicians are known to have made a lengthy sojourn. They have been found in Cyprus, at Kition, which was strictly a Phœnician city, and at Amathus, where

the influence of Syrian culture seems to have been long predominant.[1] At these places they were of marble, but those discovered in Malta and Gozo were all of terra-cotta.[2] We have seen that the Phœnicians at home also made use of this material. In Sicily two at least, perhaps three, have been found in the neighbourhood of Solunte, an old Phœnician city on the northern coast, some leagues west of Panormus, the modern Palermo.[3] They are both of marble. The excavations on the site of Carthage have not yet brought any anthropoid sarcophagi to light, and it is thought, therefore, that those of Solunte were carved for Phœnician immigrants rather than for the native Punic merchants.

Corsica, too, has furnished similar relics. The Phœnicians, so long established in Sardinia and on the Ligurian coast, certainly had naval stations, factories, or at least harbours of refuge and victualling ports, on the shores of the smaller island; and some of



FIG. 131.—Comparative sections of a Phœnician sarcophagus and an Egyptian mummy-case. From Renan.

their people must there have died and found their graves. This is proved by the monument noticed by Merimée, in 1840, as a "statue of Appriciani," but of which the true character escaped him.[4] The materials for comparison were then, in fact, beyond his reach. But the conditions were changed when the Louvre was

[1] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 53.

[2] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 424. CARUANA, *Report on the Phœnician and Roman Antiquities in the Group of the Islands of Malta* (8vo, Malta, 1882), p. 29. One of those here quoted bears a male, the other a female, figure.

[3] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 405, 406. Of these two sarcophagi one was found in 1695, the other in 1725. It appears from the plates to Orville (*Sicula*, vol. i., Amsterdam, 1764, p. 42 *et seq.*) that three of these sarcophagi were known in the eighteenth century. Only two are known at present. They are both in the museum at Palermo, and were described by D'ONDES REGGIO in 1864, in the *Bullettino della commissione di antichità e di belle arti in Sicilia*, p. 1, pl. i. Nos. 1-3. As early as 1847 FRANCESCO DI GIOVANNI recognized their Phœnician origin; his paper is printed at the head of the *Bullettino*, before that of d'Ondes Reggio.

[4] *Notes d'un Voyage en Corse*, p. 53 *et seq.* The condition of the monument is too bad to warrant the reproduction of Merimée's sketches in these pages.

enriched by many specimens of the same kind. The collation was then made with great care and precision by a young official who was too soon lost to science, M. Aucapitaine,[1] and there can now be no doubt that in this monument we have the granite lid of a sarcophagus like those from Sidon. The head is freely disengaged from the shoulders, a detail which is only to be found in those sarcophagi which seem latest in date.[2]

These anthropoid sarcophagi belong to two different types; the simpler of the two is that to which we have drawn attention by several examples (Figs. 124, 126, 128, and 129). Here the head alone is figured on the lid, sometimes with the neck and the roundness of the shoulders slightly indicated. This is by far the commonest pattern; but the excavations of M. Renan at Saïda have brought another to light, in which the sculptor has not

FIG. 132.—Anthropoid sarcophagus from Sidon. Louvre. Length 8 feet 10 inches.

hesitated to attempt a much more detailed rendering of the human form. This precious monument is now in the Louvre; it was recovered piece by piece from the earth, so often disturbed, of the cave of Apollo.[3] The head alone is missing (Fig. 132). In this coffin the legs and hips are still buried in the mass of the lid, but the arms are shown, one on either side of the body, and the left hand grasping a small perfume-bottle. These arms are bare, as the tunic only covers the shoulders. The feet, too, stood out formerly beyond the robe, but they have been broken off.

[1] *Les Phéniciens en Corse*, in the *Revue africaine*, Algiers, 1862, p. 471, and plate attached to the article.

[2] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 864.

[3] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 403, and the *Journal des Fouilles* (Gaillardot), *ibid.* pp. 437, 438.

The material is a fine, white marble, like that of the sarcophagi already described.

For a time this sarcophagus was thought to be unique, but the interest excited by its discovery had the effect of drawing attention to the two examples in the museum of Palermo, where they had remained unnoticed for so long. They were at once recognized as belonging to the same class as the sarcophagus from Sidon. One of the two supplies a link between the types we have described. The arms are shown in their places on the flanks of the body, but there is neither costume nor accessory (Fig. 133). The other is more archaic in its general aspect, but, of all these monuments, it is that in which the sculptor has carried his work the farthest. In the result we have what is nothing short of a recumbent statue (Fig. 134). It shows us a woman robed in a



FIG. 133.—Sarcophagus from Solunte. In the Palermo Museum.

short sleeveless tunic and a long peplos falling to the feet; the right arm lies along the body, the hand resting on the thigh, while the left is bent at the elbow, so that the hand with its perfume-bottle rests upon the stomach. The breasts are indicated under the drapery; as in the terra-cotta statuettes, the plaited tresses hang down upon the neck and chest. The sinuous lines of this sarcophagus and the stone support on which the feet rest are enough to prove that the Egyptian mummy-case was its point of departure.[1] The two sarcophagi of Palermo and the fragments of the one from Sidon must then be taken to belong to one group of monuments. Sicilian explorers cannot be too strongly encouraged to go on with their work of excavation in the

[1] These two sarcophagi have been engraved from photographs for which we have to thank Signor Salinas, the keeper of the Palermo Museum. Of that reproduced in Fig. 133 only the lid was found. The trough is a restoration in wood.

neighbourhood of Solunte; from all that we know of the facts, it appears certain that the tombs in which these two sarcophag were found were intact up till the moment of discovery.[1]

As to the comparative age of these sarcophagi, we cannot think that those upon which heads, arms, and feet are sculptured give the older of the two types. Notwithstanding what has been said, we must assert that the modelling of those parts of the body which are visible has nothing either Egyptian or Assyrian about it.[2] Both kinds of anthropoid sarcophagus were, in fact, made at one and the same time; the criterion to which we must look for help in establishing a chronological series is the shape of the lower half of the coffin and the relation it bears to its prototype, the mummy-case. Looked at from this point of view, the specimens of this second group must be placed towards the middle of the series formed by the whole collection of these anthropoid sarcophagi.[3] We arrive at a similar result if we ask how things passed in Egypt. There the type in which the arms are shown is later than that in which we see nothing but the head.[4]

None of the anthropoid sarcophagi have any inscription, and yet no surface could be better fitted for such a thing than these smooth lids, where, at first sight, it looks as if all ornament had been forbidden on purpose to leave free scope for the cutter of epitaphs. But the absence of anything of the kind ceases to surprise us when we remember that the anthropoid sarcophagi of Sidon were coloured over the whole of their surfaces. If they had any inscriptions at all, those inscriptions must have been painted on them like the vertical labels on the mummy-cases, which give, as a rule, the name of their occupants. Neither must we forget that these sarcophagi were not tombs, but marble

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 406. D'ORVILLE, *Sicula*, plate A, gives a section of one of these tombs. A flight of steps gives access to a square chamber in which three sarcophagi are shown, one facing the door, the two others at the sides.

[2] DE LONGPERIER thought he could recognize something in common between the sarcophagus of Mugharet-Abloun and the Assyrian sculptures of the reign of Assurnazirpal (*Musée Napoléon III.*, plate xvii.). We believe that for once in a way that fine connoisseur was mistaken. But the similarity between that monument and the Palermo sarcophagi is great, and the execution of the latter is of such a kind that d'Ondes Reggio is inclined to ascribe them to the period of Alexander the Great.

[3] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 419.

[4] MARIETTE, *Notice du Musée de Boulak*, second edition, p. 43.



FIG. 134.—Marble sarcophagus found at Solunte. Palermo Museum.

coffins; they were not meant to be seen; buried in deep and carefully sealed caverns, they served to honour the dead, but inscriptions on them would have been practically useless. The sarcophagus of Esmounazar is an exception to this rule, but then it was not found in a hypogeum; moreover, it had never been painted. Placed in a grave and covered by a pavilion reared against the rocky mass of Mugharet-Abloun, it was almost in the open air, and may even have been visible to the passer-by.[1]

Are the heads on these sarcophagi portraits? or rather, are they meant for portraits? When the time comes to study the few existing remains of Phœnician sculpture, we shall attempt to answer that question; at present we must confine ourselves to reminding our readers how many anthropoid sarcophagi were of terra-cotta. This implies a regular trade, an industry, so far at least as it concerns those for which clay supplied the material. In order to bring them within reach of any but the richer classes, the masks with which they were adorned must have been obtained by the help of moulds which could be used again and again.[2]

But the anthropoid sarcophagi are not the only ones to be found in those rectangular tomb-chambers which come down to us from the time when Phœnicia still preserved all the originality she ever had. They also contained vast troughs of white marble, with lids triangular in section but very flat (Fig. 135). The oldest coffins, those cut from the limestone of the Lebanon, were of this shape; with the progress of luxury a finer material was brought from abroad, from Paros or some other of the western islands. It was so well chiselled and polished that even in the complete absence of ornament we are impressed by a certain beauty due to the great size of the coffins, to their good proportions, and to the excellence of their workmanship.[3]

Either for economy or for some reason which escapes us, stone coffins seem at one period to have been superseded by wooden ones. In those forests of Lebanon of which only a few shreds now remain, the Phœnicians had supplies which must have seemed

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 426, 427.

[2] Among all the museums of Europe the richest in these anthropoid sarcophagi is that of the Louvre, thanks to the missions of MM. Rey and Renan; but there are also fine examples from the Syrian coast in the British Museum and at Constantinople (REINACH, *Catalogue du Musée impérial d'Antiquités de Tchinli Kiosk*, 1882, No. 21). Those in the museum of New York were found in Cyprus.

[3] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 427.

inexhaustible of that timber upon which the ancients set the highest value, the sweet-smelling, incorruptible cedar. But although the fame of that beautiful wood was not undeserved, the great rains that wash the whole Syrian coast in winter ended by giving a good account of the cedar planks of which these coffins were made; their shapes, however, may be restored from the nails and clamps



Fig. 135.—Sarcophagus from Sidon. Louvre. Length 7 feet 4 inches.

by which they were held together; these have been found in many cases on the floors of the tomb-chambers. Strong iron rings with iron rods attached to them and bent into right angles (Fig. 136)[1] have also been dug up. The use of these rods may easily be guessed; they afforded a good hold for the rings. The ends of the double rod were driven deeply into the planks which formed

Fig. 136.—Iron holdfast and coffin handle. From Renan.

the coffin sides; the rest was then bent flat with the planks, the ring standing out above and acting as a handle by which the coffin could be lifted or slung.[2] These rings correspond, in fact, to the

[1] The length of the straight part of this double rod gives the thickness of the coffin wall, viz. 8 inches.

[2] See the note from the *Journal des Fouilles* of Gaillardot, in the *Mission de Phénicie*, additions and corrections, pp. 866, 867.

blocks of marble which stand out from most of the anthropoid sarcophagi.

The Phœnicians were not content with thus providing for the easy management of these heavy coffins. They decorated them with plaques of metal. At least in the more elaborate examples the rings were placed in the jaws of lions' heads, many of which in bronze more or less oxidized have been found in the Sidonian tombs.[1] These masks, as may be seen from the example in the Louvre which we reproduce, are by no means wanting in character (Fig. 137). We are enabled to restore the whole of these arrangements by the help of the sarcophagi of the Greek and Roman period, in which they were imitated in stone (Fig. 138). In these the lions' heads are connected one with another by heavy garlands bound about with ribbons. This ornament may have been founded on reality. The handles of the wooden coffins may have been wreathed by garlands of real leaves and flowers during the funeral ceremonies.[2]

We are inclined to believe that the use of these decorated wooden coffins dates from a fairly remote epoch—from that of the Persian domination at least. There is, in the first place, the suggestive fact that under the Romans and the last of the Seleucids the type was reproduced in a material different from that first employed; such transpositions are always an affair of time. The bronze masks were certainly the originals of those carved by the decorators of the stone sarcophagi; in style they are broader and simpler than the copies, which are always commonplace in execution. When the tomb-chamber from which the best examples of these masks now in the Louvre were brought was first penetrated, the four masks it contained were found on the floor, near one wall of the chamber, and laid one within the other; the rings and nails were lying in an opposite corner. Such an arrangement was certainly not the work of treasure-seekers and tomb-breakers. Wherever these gentry went they left evident traces of the precipitation with which they carried out their work of pillage and

[1] The Louvre possesses several of these masks, the fruit of M. Péretié's excavations and of those of M. Renan. There are as many in the collection of M. Louis le Clercq, and for every specimen spared by the rust hundreds must have perished. M. Renan tells us that most of the sepulchres of Sidon are very damp (*Mission*, p. 867).

[2] This is an ingenious and probable suggestion of M. GAILLARDOT's (*Mission de Phénicie*, p. 867).

destruction. But if we suppose that after a few hundreds of years tombs belonging to extinct families were reopened for use a second time, the state in which this chamber was found is to be readily explained. The slow action of the centuries had reduced the cedar planks to dust; the ironwork had fallen to the ground, and

FIG. 137.—Lion's mask. Bronze. Louvre. Diameter 22 inches.

the new visitors to the tomb collected it together with all that was left of the bodies of the first proprietors of the sepulchre. As they refrained from carrying off the bronze ornaments, we may suppose that they treated those remains with respect and gave them a new asylum before they prepared the chamber for the reception

FIG. 138.—Sarcophagus of Sidon. From Renan.

of its new occupant.[1] We may guess that the evidence thus brought under their eyes of the comparative inability of cedar coffins to resist the climate of these hypogea, determined the Phœnicians to abandon their use and to return to stone sarcophagi, on which, however, they took care to reproduce the ornamental details of the cases in which the great princes of independent Phœnicia had been put to their rest.

The Phœnicians did not burn their dead. The few traces of cremation which have been encountered in the cemeteries belong evidently to the classic decadence. The explorer is soon convinced of this by the shapes and sizes of the graves, coffins, and sarcophagi, which are always governed by the proportions of the intact human body. None of the skeletons discovered, whether whole or in fragments, show any trace of the action of fire. The funerary furniture has exactly the same character as with the Egyptians and Chaldæans; as in the tombs of these two peoples the objects of which that garnishing is made up are partly arranged round the walls of the chamber, partly placed on the body itself. Thus we often find set up against the wall those perfume phials which, in most cases, are identical in shape with the Greek alabastron;[2] these are of glass, of terra-cotta, and sometimes, but not often, of oriental alabaster. One of the latter material was brought from Sidon by M. Renan (Fig. 139);[3] it is shaped carefully, and highly polished. A few ivory ones, very delicately shaped, have also been found.

The presence of these perfume vases in tombs is to be explained by man's natural desire to retard, or at least to hide, the decomposition of the body. Vague hopes and superstitious fears led him to deposit idols and amulets of every kind beside the dead, who were then placed after death under the protection of the gods whom they had adored during life. Mysterious symbols were scattered broadcast over the walls and floors of the tomb, each one of which might attract the attention and wake the sympathy of

[1] According to those who explored it, this particular tomb contained nothing but the bronze masks and the ironwork of which we have spoken, but in many chambers in the same neighbourhood the stone coffers, with carved masks and garlands which mark the period of the decadence, were found (*Mission de Phénicie*, p. 866.)

[2] In a tomb close to the Mugharet-Abloun thirty of these bottles were found ranged against the wall.

[3] *Mission*, p. 432.

some tutelary deity. All this points to a set of ideas analogous to those we described in our study of the Egyptian tomb and of the



FIG. 139.—Alabastron. Louvre. Actual size.

statuettes which were deposited in it in thousands;[1] but in Phœnicia these ideas were neither so precise nor so profoundly

[1] *Art in Ancient Egypt*, vol. i. chap. iii.

felt as in Egypt. The Phœnicians were without the speculative genius; a nation of merchants, they were occupied with the affairs of this world rather than with those of the next.

We shall have to return to the Phœnician terra-cottas to examine their style and *facture;* at present we must be content with pointing out their sepulchral character, and indicating their principal subjects. Among those which compose the rich collection in the Louvre there are some, no doubt, from temples, where they must have arrived as votive offerings; but all those archæologists who have a personal knowledge of Phœnicia are agreed that in the main these objects come from the cemeteries.[1]

FIG. 140.—Baal-Hammon. Terra-cotta. Louvre. Height 4¾ inches.

They all appear to be figures of gods. Among others have been recognized Baal-Hammon, sitting on his throne between two rams[2] (Fig. 140); Bes, whose image was in Egypt an emblem of

[1] HEUZEY, *Catalogue des Figurines antiques de Terre cuite du Musée du Louvre*, 1882, pp. 55, 67, 77. RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 461, 475, 476, 484. M. PÉRETIÉ Chancellor to the French Consulate at Beyrout, has been exploring in Phœnicia for the last forty years, and it is mainly by excavation in the cemeteries that he has succeeded in forming his rich collection. As M. Heuzey remarks, the good condition of most of the terra-cottas which have come to the Louvre from M. Péretié is enough to prove that those figures belong to the class of objects to which the tomb gave a comparatively secure shelter.

[2] HEUZEY, *Catalogue, Phénicie*, 190. DE LONGPÉRIER, *Musée Napoléon III.*, pl. xxiii. Fig. 3. We have already reproduced (Fig. 25) a much better example of the same type, of which, however, the exact *provenance* is unknown; the specimen here figured was found in Northern Phœnicia, near Tortosa.

joy, and was therefore associated in tombs, and especially on the pillows found in tombs, with the idea of a resurrection. He was also represented as guardian of one of the pylons of the infernal regions (Fig. 21).[1] The pigmy-god, a near relation of Bes, is encountered no less frequently (Fig. 22). To show how great a popularity Bes enjoyed in the matter of these sepulchral figures, we may quote a monument that comes from Beyrout, a scarab in glazed earthenware, in which the forms of the god and the sacred insect are actually blended together (Fig. 141). "If we hold this little object at a particular angle we distinctly see the grimacing face with its tongue thrust out; the joints of the beetle's armour form the feather crown, which is an attribute of the Egyptian Bes. Some hieroglyphs are carved on the flat underside, but as in so

FIG. 141.—Scarab, with face of Bes. Louvre.[2]

many of the Phœnician imitations, they have no sense. It is well known that the image of Ptah in a state of embryo, which resembles Bes in more than one respect, often carries on its head a representation of the insect so constantly associated in Egyptian symbolism with the god of Memphis."[3]

The distinctive characteristics of the various goddesses who were adored in Syria are as yet so far from being well established that we cannot attempt even to propose a name for each of the types of which the group of female divinities is composed. We are tempted to recognize an Astarte in the divinity, sometimes enthroned

[1] T. DE ROUGÉ, *Notice des Monuments Égyptiens*, 1873, p. 143. MARIETTE, *La Galerie de l'Égypte ancienne au Trocadéro*, 1878, p. 116, cf. p. 10. See also HEUZEY, *Catalogue*, pp. 73-80.

[2] See HEUZEY, *Catalogue des Figurines antiques de Terre cuite*, plate viii. Fig. 3.

[3] HEUZEY, *Catalogue, Phénicie*, No. 206.

(Fig. 20), sometimes standing (Fig. 142), who presses a dove against her breast; before being consecrated to the Greek Aphrodite the dove was the special property of some oriental deities and especially of the Syrian Astarte.[1] We have more difficulty in

[1] The dove, said the Greeks, had been consecrated to Aphrodite ever since the beginning of time, on account of its warm and amorous temperament (APOLLODORUS, quoted by the scholiast of Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonaut*, iii. 593); but of all the Greek goddesses Aphrodite was the one to keep the most strongly marked traces of her Oriental origin. Greece made the fair goddess her own entirely by the beauty which her artists began to give her at the end of the fifth century; her worship and her attributes preserved to the last much of their Oriental character. To this the Greeks themselves were quite alive, as we may see from a myth which, in spite of its neglect by poetry and art, has nevertheless a very real importance for the historian; I mean the story given by HYGINUS (*Fabulæ*, 197). An egg, they say, fell from the sky into the River Euphrates; fishes carried it to the bank, a dove sat upon it and hatched Aphrodite! By this tradition a connection was established between the goddess born on the banks of the Euphrates, who was the prototype of Aphrodite, and the dove. We cannot point to any texts or monuments which prove that the dove was consecrated to one of those goddesses of fertility who were adored under various names by the eastern Shemites, but so far as it concerns the Syrian goddesses, who were no more than the daughters of those of Chaldæa and Assyria, the fact is proved. It was demonstrated long ago that the Semiramis, whose career is given by DIODORUS (II. iv. 20), was not a human personage, but a divinity whose legend had been transferred, after a fashion that was common enough in such cases, to a mortal heroine (FR. LENORMANT, *La Légende de Sémiramis*, a paper presented to the *Académie de Belgique*, January 8, 1872). Several authors declare that Semiramis was worshipped as a goddess both in the valley of the Euphrates and in Syria, and particularly at Ascalon and Hierapolis (ATHENAGORAS, *Legatio pro Christianis*, 26; LUCIAN, *De dea Syria*, 14 and 33; DIODORUS, II. xx. 2); the tie by which she is attached in legend to Derceto, the great goddess of Ascalon, shows that Semiramis was no more than one form of the type adored under different names by all the Shemitic tribes of the interior and of the coast; and we know that the dove was especially consecrated to that Derceto-Semiramis of Ascalon and Northern Syria. According to Diodorus, Semiramis was nursed by doves, and at her death was changed into a dove; the very word Semiramis, according to Ctesias, meant dove in the lauguage of the country. In the temple of Hierapolis they showed Lucian a statue which passed for that of Semiramis; a golden dove was perched upon its head. Finally, upon the coins struck at Ascalon in the time of the Roman emperors, we find a goddess, Derceto or Semiramis, who has a dove sometimes beside her, sometimes on her open hand (ECKHEL, *Doctrina Nummorum Veterum*, vol. iii. p. 445). The attribution of the dove to the Astarte of Syria and Paphos is, if possible, still better attested. The poets make frequent allusion to it (TIBULLUS, I. viii. 17; MARTIAL, VIII. xxviii. 13). ATHENÆUS (x. 51) speaks of the doves of Eryx, and the tradition he gives us implies a narrow connection between them and the Astarte who was worshipped in Sicily. Finally, both in Phœnicia and in Cyprus we find the dove placed in the hands of all those female figures in which archæologists agree in recognising either the images of the goddess herself or those of her priestesses.

finding a plausible appellation for some other statuettes of which the physiognomy is very peculiar. These are, as a rule, seated and draped in a robe falling to the feet. The head-dress, which seems to be an exaggerated version of the Egyptian coiffure, forms a round and ample mass on each side of the forehead. The left

FIG. 142.—Astarte. Terra-cotta. Louvre. Height 10¾ inches.

FIG. 143.—Mother goddess. Terra-cotta. Louvre.

arm hangs down by the side, the right is bent so that the hand rests upon the stomach, which by its abnormal salience seems to suggest a state of pregnancy (Fig. 143).[1] Statuettes of this type are continually found in Cyprus. They are closely connected with

[1] HEUZEY, *Catalogue, Phénicie*, Nos. 192-194.

those representing the same woman with a child in her breast, of which more than one example has been furnished by the Cypriot tombs, although none have yet been encountered on the Syrian coast (Fig. 144).

The presence of these nurses and mother-goddesses in the tombs is not surprising. Their deposit in such places was universal in the antique world. The connection of ideas is obvious. By placing in the sepulchre figures of those divinities who presided over the birth and early years of every living being, who watched over the fertility of nature and her incessant renewal, a sort of

FIG. 144.—Mother goddess. Terra-cotta. Louvre.[1]

emblematic promise was held out to its tenant of a future and immortal life.

Another object often found in the cemeteries is a terra-cotta chariot drawn by two or four horses, and occupied by one or more persons (Fig. 145). We must be on our guard against looking upon these as toys or decorative objects. They embody an allusion to the state and circumstance which, after surrounding the occupant during life, was supposed to follow him in his supreme migration. Little as we know about the customs and beliefs of the Phœnicians,

[1] HEUZEY, *Figurines*, plate vi. fig. 6.

it is difficult to refuse our assent to this explanation now that the same subject has been found developed on the principal face of the remarkable Phœnician sarcophagus of Amathus, in a bas-relief which recalls the style of these terra-cottas in spite of its general Assyrian character.[1] The tradition passed from the East, with many others, into Etruria, where chariots both for war and peace

FIG. 145.—Terra-cotta chariot. Louvre. Height 8 inches.

are often figured on sepulchral monuments. There we even find them led by the genii of death, who escort them to the gates of the infernal regions.[2] In this the Etruscans thrust ideas baldly forward

[1] We reproduce this sarcophagus on a future page.

[2] *Annali dell' Instituto Archeologico*, 1879, p. 299; article by GUST. KORTE, entitled: *Vasi Etruschi con Rappresentanze Relative all' Inferno.* See also plates iv. and v. in vol. xi. of the *Monimenti.*

which were gently hinted at in earlier representations; their first germ existed in our little Phœnician chariots of terra-cotta.[1]

Gods, goddesses, chariots, all these terra-cotta figures, embellished here and there with touches of colour, are the peculiar property of Phœnicia; but side by side with them, in the cemeteries on the coast, we find amulets and statuettes of glazed earthenware, or "Egyptian fayence." Was this fayence imported from Egypt or made in the workshops of Tyre or Sidon? This question will have to be answered at length elsewhere; here we must be content with stating the fact that many of the Phœnician dead had figures of the jackal-headed Anubis and other Egyptian objects of the same class, such as scarabs, symbolic eyes, &c., placed with them in their tombs. Among the booty he won from Sidonian tomb-chambers M. Renan mentions a small silver statuette of Anher or Onouris (Nofre-toum); another of the same material of the ram-headed god Chnouphis; a third, in blue fayence, of the god Amen. He found necklaces made of separate pieces, each representing either a god or some sacred animal of Egypt.[2] One might almost fancy oneself in Egypt; but on account, no doubt, of the greater dampness of the soil, the white, green, and blue enamels have not kept their lustre so well as in that country. They are often half destroyed, and even where the surface still remains the tints have faded.

Another custom borrowed from Egypt by Phœnicia was that of placing leaves of gold over all the openings in the body, and especially over the eyes. These golden spectacles are by no means rare in Phœnicia.[3] Golden masks have also been found there. M. Louis le Clercq has two in his collection, they are about half life size; one reproduces the features of a woman, the other those of a bearded man.

Of all the objects we have enumerated, some, like the leaves of gold and the bottles of perfume, were meant to ward off the final dissolution of the corpse; others, like the amulets and statuettes, were intended to insure for the dead, by their magic virtues, a protection against the terrible but unknown dangers of the

[1] HEUZEY, *Catalogue*, pp. 65, 66.

[2] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 487, 488. The small objects found at Byblos were of the same character (*Mission*, p. 214). In the collection of M. Louis le Clercq, which is in some respects richer in Phœnician antiquities even than that of the Louvre, a whole case is filled with small objects of Assyrian earthenware—statuettes, scarabs amulets—all of which were found in Syria.

[3] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 421, 422.

subterranean world. As a natural effect of the beliefs which suggested these arrangements, the piety of relations led them to deposit in the grave such instruments of daily life as the defunct had been in the habit of using and the jewels with which he had adorned his person.[1]

Lamps are continually found. They were left burning no doubt when the tomb was closed. Small amphoræ held, we may guess, a supply of water.[2] Women were entombed with their bracelets, with the rings of bronze and silver which they wore upon their ankles, with their necklaces, ear-rings and finger-rings, with the metal mirrors before which they had so often plaited their long tresses, and the pencil they had used to heighten the shadows about their eyes. Boxes, cups, and vases filled with various cosmetics completed the battery of the female toilet.



FIG. 146.—Silver ring, with scarab in agate. Actual size. From Renan.

Beside the corpse of a man was placed his seal, often mounted in a silver ring (Fig. 146).[3] It is curious that in the long and carefully compiled list of objects found during a course of excavations in the necropolis of Sidon extending over two years, we do not find a single weapon of any kind or a fragment of one. In the case of every other people by whom tombs were filled with these relics of the life passed above, swords and lances, shields and helmets, are encountered at every step. The peculiarity can only be explained by the national character and habits of the Phœnicians. They were a people of merchants and not of

[1] See GAILLARDOT, *Journal des Fouilles*, in the *Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 469, 473, 478, &c., and the list of objects found in the necropolis of Saïda, classed by tombs.

[2] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 473.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 477, 478, and 488, 489.

warriors; the splendid weapons they made were for sale and export, not for use by themselves, except in the most strict defensive; the wealth and power on which they so prided themselves were not conquered at the point of the sword.

§ 4.—*The Phœnician Tomb away from Phœnicia.*

We began by studying, in all necessary detail, the Phœnician tomb as we find it within the borders of Phœnicia itself, at Gebal, at Tyre, and at Sidon. But the Phœnicians travelled so much, they lived and died so often outside their own boundaries, that their bones are to be found scattered on every shore of the Mediterranean. Where, indeed, should we fail to encounter their sepulchres, had it not been for the number destroyed, usurped, or put to other uses during the great movement of Græco-Roman civilization? It is only by a happy accident that we sometimes come upon one of those isolated graves in which some sailor overtaken by death during a distant expedition has been hastily interred. We can hardly hope to discover many more of the narrow grave-yards which lay about those distant ports where a few merchants kept open shop for Celts, Africans, or Ligurians, or where a few soldiers mounted guard over a depot of provisions; and yet it was, perhaps, in one of these outpost cemeteries that the Corsican sarcophagus with its carved head was found.

The case of a city founded by Phœnicia in a country into which her influence had deeply penetrated was rather different. Wherever her supremacy was of long duration and her people formed a considerable proportion of the inhabitants, the cemeteries were too large to disappear without leaving a trace behind; and this remark applies to places much smaller than Carthage, the great city which grew to be so much more powerful and populous than her parent state. From various circumstances it resulted that some of these cemeteries in the East and West of Europe remained unknown and unexplored down to our own day, so that their treasures were far better guarded than those of the mother country. We may therefore learn a great deal from visits to burial-places in which none but people vastly inferior in wealth and dignity to the merchant princes of Tyre and Sidon had been entombed. These provincial grave-yards, as we may call them,

have many pleasant surprises for the archæologist; in them he will sometimes encounter complete series of monuments which are entirely absent from the tombs of Phœnicia. Thus we find that objects of earthenware, so uncommon on the Tyrian coast, abound in the tombs of Cyprus, while those of Sardinia have furnished a series of scarabs richer and more varied than any we could possibly form from those found in graves on the main shore of the Mediterranean.

We need look for no additions to our stores from *Bekaa* or Cœle-Syria.[1] Down to the Roman epoch the whole of this region was in a very rude and primitive state.[2] According to Strabo,[3] it was entirely given over to robbers and savages. The trade route skirted it on the north and the south, but the Phœnicians did not penetrate within the range. The lower valley of the Orontes and the oasis of Damascus were in the same condition. Over the whole of that district another people, another civilization, and another set of customs were to be encountered. Damascus is certainly one of the oldest cities in the world, and close beside it rise the rocky escarpments of the Djebel Kasioum. If that mountain had been in Phœnicia its sides would have been fitted with sepulchral chambers, but as it is, not a single vestige of such a thing is to be found.[4] It was, in fact, on the sea that the doors and windows of Phœnicia opened, and it is on that side, on the coasts and islands of the Mediterranean, that we must look for points of comparison and for supplements to the narrow information we can draw from the parent state itself.

First of all we must cross over to Cyprus, which was certainly the earliest colony of the Phœnicians. During many centuries they maintained themselves in the island in great force, at least over all its southern half. Their tombs are consequently very numerous, and the only difficulty is to distinguish them from those of the Greeks, who also colonized Cyprus at a very remote period, and ended by gaining the upper hand after living there in contact with the Phœnicians for many centuries. Two points have to

[1] The only rock-cut cemetery in the whole of this region, that of *Bereitan*, near Baalbek, is of slight interest. Nothing but troughs of simple form and without ornament is to be found in it (DE SAULCY, *Voyage autour de la Mer morte*, plates liv. and lv.

[2] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 836.

[3] STRABO, XVI. ii. 18.

[4] According to Gaillardot (RENAN, *Mission*, p. 350).

be considered in attempting to make the distinction. In the first place we can only look for Phœnician sepulchres in that part of the island in which the language, religion, and political supremacy of Phœnicia survived to the time of Alexander; secondly, we shall only accept as Phœnician such tombs as, by their arrangement and the objects found in them, recall those we have examined on the Syrian coast, and reveal the nationality of their first proprietors.

Kition, on the southern coast, remained a thoroughly Syrian town down to a very late date. This we gather from the numerous Phœnician texts found on its side, or in its immediate neighbourhood. Of these there are not less than seventy-eight, and a certain number are funerary in their character.[1] Think, too, for a moment of what the modern successor of Kition is called; it is called *Larnaca*, and the most probable derivation of the name is from the Greek λάρναξ, a box or coffer; *ta larnaca* would mean "the sarcophagi"; and we may suppose that the name was given to the town in the middle ages, from the great number of those stone troughs which lay about its site, and were encountered whenever ground was broken. Almost all these remains have disappeared. Larnaca has never ceased to be what is called an important city in Turkey, that is to say a city with a population to be counted by thousands. Masons and lime-burners have reduced to powder every block of marble or limestone on which they could lay their hands; and yet the excavations made in the environs of Larnaca have laid bare the Phœnician sepulchres at more than one point. We are told that an anthropoid sarcophagus was found in one of them,[2] and that the same chamber contained some alabaster vases, upon one of which a short Phœnician inscription was still decipherable (Fig. 147). There were, too, some painted terra-cotta vases, in the decoration of which no motives had been employed but those we have already encountered in Assyria and Phœnicia.[3]

But most of the tombs opened at Larnaca belong to the Græco-Roman period. The richest necropolis in really ancient tombs is that of Idalion, where one of the most famous sanctuaries of that

[1] *Corpus Inscr. Semit.* part i. Nos. 10-87.

[2] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 53.

[3] For the appearance presented by these chambers see the vignette given by CESNOLA, p. 53.

Astarte who in later years became the Aphrodite and Venus of the classic poets was situated. Even the name of Idalion has been preserved in that of the modern village of *Dali*. Cesnola tells us that he explored about fifteen thousand tombs in the canton of Dali alone,[1] and that he found many precious objects in them. But his excavations went on at many points at once; he could not be everywhere, and many of them were supervised by native foremen. Several of these men had gathered no little experience, and had a keen scent for monuments of value; they understood thoroughly how to sound the rock and to follow a vein until it was exhausted; but they troubled themselves little enough with the arrangement of the tombs into which they penetrated, and even had they been willing they were unable to take sections or to draw a plan. General di



FIG. 147.—Alabaster vases. From Kition.[2]

Cesnola was prevented by his very eagerness as an archæologist from supplementing the ignorance of his agents. It would have been easy for him to serve his apprenticeship as draughtsman and surveyor on the ground itself, but his keenness for new discoveries, the journeys he made about the island in every direction, and the number of digging campaigns he carried on at once in cantons far removed from each other, left him no leisure for anything of the kind. We owe too much to his energy to have any desire to quarrel with it; General di Cesnola has by himself disinterred more monuments of ancient art in Cyprus than all the other explorers put together; with the comparatively feeble resources of a private individual, he has brought to light hundreds of figures and thousands of vases and jewels, while the English Government,

[1] *Cyprus*, p. 64.

[2] From CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 54.

which has now been for five years absolute master of the island, has brought nothing from it of any importance.[1] We may, however, be allowed to express our regret that to his other services Cesnola has not added that of giving us plans, sections, and elevations of the tombs and other civil or religious edifices he was the first to explore. The few figures of this class which are sprinkled at rare intervals over his pages look too much as if they had been compiled from memory.[2] The absence of documents of this kind is sure to lead to more than one misapprehension. But vague as it is we must now endeavour to make the best use we can of Cesnola's narrative and of such other sources of information as are open to us.

The tombs in the oldest part of the Idaliot necropolis are oven-shaped. Their width varies from six to ten feet, their height from about four feet to six feet, and their depth from five feet one inch to eight feet.[3] As a rule, a short and narrow corridor leads from the door to the interior. When the earth in which the tombs are dug is loose, their walls are solidified by a lining of mixed clay and chopped straw; but where the tomb is excavated in the rock this precaution is dispensed with. On three sides of the chamber there is a ledge about thirty-two inches high, upon which the corpses were laid. Of these there were sometimes only one or two, sometimes as many as five or six. Each sepulchre appears to have served a single family. Fig. 148 shows how the bodies were arranged in a tomb for three persons; those on the right and left were always laid with their heads to the door. The vases and other items of sepulchral furniture were placed sometimes on the ledge, sometimes at a lower level, in the space left free in the

[1] Upon the life and discoveries of General di Cesnola, see the second of my articles on the Island of Cyprus in the *Revue des deux Mondes* (December 1, 1878, February 1, and May 15, 1879). They are entitled: *L'île de Cypre, son rôle dans l'Histoire.* In the same papers many facts relative to the other explorers who, between the years 1862 and 1876, have revealed Cypriot art to western archæology, will be found. It will here suffice to enumerate the names of MM. Lang, Sandwith, de Maricourt, de Vogüé, Duthoit, Guillaume Rey, Tiburce, Piéridis, and Georgio Colonna Ceccaldi.

[2] Look, for instance, at the figures on pages 66 and 67. The transverse section does not agree with the plan. The latter, moreover, has no references, neither does it agree in every respect with the text in which it is inframed.

[3] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 66. CECCALDI, *Monuments antiques de Chypre*, p. 35. SANDWITH, *On the Different Styles of Pottery found in Ancient Tombs in the Island of Cyprus* (*Archæologia*, vol. xlv. 1877, pp. 127-142).

centre of the chamber. In some cases an earthenware dish turned upside down was placed pillow-wise under the head. There was no trace of coffins, and the tomb was closed by a small slab fitted into the opening.

The oldest of all these tombs, according to Cesnola, are those he opened in that part of the cemetery which lies near the village of Alambra.[1] They represent the earliest period in the civilization of the island. This seems to be proved by the extreme rudeness of the objects found, objects of earthenware decorated entirely with geometric patterns, incised and not painted figures, so coarsely modelled with the thumb as to be thoroughly grotesque. Among



Fig. 148.—Plan of a tomb at Dali. From Cesnola.

these figures and earthen vessels many bronze objects were also found, fragments of blades, short-swords, knives, hatchets, tools, mirrors, needles, and round cups. And, we are told, a constant relation could be traced between the character of the statuettes and the bronze instruments by which they were accompanied. Arms were found in the same tombs as figures of horsemen, of charioteers, or of foot-soldiers with shield and helmet (Fig. 149 and Plate II.); on the other hand, whenever mirrors, needles, and long hair-pins were encountered, they were sure to be accompanied by images of that mother-goddess, who is figured sometimes with her hands on her breasts, sometimes with them laid on her

[1] Cesnola, *Cyprus*, p. 87.

stomach (Fig. 150). This figure seems to have been reserved for the tombs of women, while those of warriors were placed by the coffins of men.[1]

Some tombs, like those of Alambra, from their furnishing and general arrangement and from the more advanced artistic style of the objects found in them, may be ascribed to a later date. The ornament is still carried out in lines, but is painted as well as engraved, and skilfully-made trinkets are found as well as bronze weapons.[2] Metal cups, too, have been found decorated with concentric zones round a central rosette or medallion.[3]

FIG. 149.—Terra-cotta statuette. Cyprus.[4]

FIG. 150.—Terra-cotta statuette. Cyprus.[4]

We have no hesitation in recognizing in all these tombs, whether the pottery they contain is incised or painted, those of Phœnicians established in the island, or at least of a population which received from them the first elements of political life. One of the vases ornamented with geometrical designs bears a Phœnician epigraph, which, we are told by General di Cesnola,

[1] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 93. Upon the cemetery at Alambra see also FRÖHNER, preface to the *Catalogue de la Collection Barre* (4to, 1878).

[2] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, pp. 68-79, and plates i. and ii.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 77, and G. COLONNA CECCALDI, *Monuments antiques de Chypre*, chapter iii.

[4] Drawn by Bénédite from the originals in the Feuardent collection.

was engraved before the vase was fired.[1] Metal cups with figures cut upon them are among those objects whose Phœnician origin is best established. In the oldest of these tombs we find types already encountered in Syria, such as horsemen and chariots in terra-cotta. The naked deity with large hips, in which archæologists agree to recognize a goddess of generation, is certainly of Chaldæan origin,[2] and who but the Phœnicians could have carried her to Cyprus? The very plan of the tomb is identical with that of some burial-places we have noticed at Amrit, Tyre, and Sidon. Before he knew anything of the discoveries in Cyprus, Gaillardot came to the conclusion that the oldest of the Sidonian tombs were those in which a chamber of moderate size had a ledge across the back of it. On that ledge, or on the floor, the bodies were placed without coffins of any kind.[3]

None of these primitive tombs were found in a virgin state in Phœnicia itself; they had all been pillaged and used a second time; but the Cypriot hills had guarded their deposits better than the rocks of the Syrian coast. The necropolis of Alambra furnished the oldest Phœnician sepulchres which have yet been discovered; we should not be astonished were it proved that they date from the first settlement of Sidonian colonists in the island, before the beginning of the eleventh century B.C. Other parts of the cemetery of Dali, those in which the painted vases and metal cups have been found, must also be very ancient; on these objects no trace is to be discovered of the influence which Greek art began to exercise over Phœnician industry towards the seventh or sixth century.

East and north-east of Dali and nearer to Larnaca lies the village of Athieno, in the neighbourhood of which a fane almost as celebrated as that of Idalion, namely, the temple of Golgos, is supposed to have stood.[4] But whether Golgos was at Athieno

[1] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 68: "Vase with Phœnician inscription burnt in on the clay."

[2] *History of Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, vol. i. p. 83 and fig. 16, vol. ii. p. 92 and figs. 41, 42.

[3] RENAN, *Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 481 and 483.

[4] This site was proposed by M. DE VOGÜÉ, and accepted by M. KIEPERT for his excellent map of the island (*New and Original Map of the Island of Cyprus*, to the scale of 1/400,000; Berlin, 1878, Dietrich Reimer). It has been disputed by M. RICHARD NEUBAUER in a paper entitled: *Der angebliche Aphrodite-tempel zu Golgoi und die daselbst gefundenen Inschriften in Kyprischen Schrift* (in the *Commentationes philologicæ in honorem Theodori Mommseni*, 1 vol. 8vo, p. 173). M. Neubauer attempts to show that Golgos was only a suburb of Paphos, and he supports his idea with texts, some of which appear to deserve serious attention.

or elsewhere is not of much importance to us at present. What is certain is that in a canton which formed part of the Phœnician kingdom of Kition there was a centre of population which kept its importance through many long centuries. None of the tombs seem to belong to a period so remote as the sepulchres of Dali ; at Athieno the bodies were, as a rule, buried in sarcophagi, some of which were adorned with elaborate sculptures, and these sculptures illustrate some of the favourite myths of the Greek poets, such as the murder of Medusa by Perseus, and the birth of Chrysaor.[1] But although the ideas and arts of Greece are to be traced to the subjects and execution of these carved pictures, although a Greek inscription may here and there be found upon them (Fig. 54), and although the majority may be no earlier in date than the sixth or even the fifth century B.C., it is none the less true that all these sarcophagi and the steles by which they are accompanied bear signs of Phœnician influence. Upon most of the steles—which stood, as a rule, in front of the two narrow faces of the sarcophagus [2]—the winged globe, sometimes of the Egyptian type, sometimes of the form peculiar to Phœnicia, appears just below the crowning ornament.[3] This ornament consists sometimes of two lions or sphinxes placed back to back (Figs. 54 and 151), sometimes of one of those curious and complex capitals of which we have already figured more than one specimen (Figs. 51, 52, 53). Sometimes the sphinxes are used in the decoration of these capitals. The way they are introduced may be seen in our reproduction of one of the steles, by which the fine sarcophagus already mentioned was accompanied (Fig. 152).[4] At each angle of the lid of this sarcophagus there is a lion couchant. We have already noticed the frequent use made of these lions and sphinxes in the decoration of Phœnician buildings, motives which came to Phœnicia from Egypt by way of Assyria, and underwent certain modifications on the way. In its own way this stele is one of the most careful works that the Phœnicians have left us ; it is also one of the best preserved.

[1] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, pp. 109-117 and plate x. G. COLONNA CECCALDI, *Monuments antiques de Chypre*, pp. 65-74 and plate vi.

[2] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 114.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 109.

[4] The knotted ribbon, painted in red, which hangs about the stele reproduced in our Fig. 151 should be noticed.

The workmanship is Greek, but the motive is thoroughly oriental. As a last proof of the close connection between Phœnicia and the occupants of these tombs, in one of them a silver patera with figures upon it has been found; it is beyond a doubt the work of some artisan of Tyre or Sidon.[1]

Were these decorated steles always used as pendents to stone sarcophagi? Were they always shut up in the tomb-chamber, or were they sometimes set up above the grave so that at least their upper part was visible above the ground and acted as a sign like the pyramid in Phœnicia proper? On these points Cesnola tells us nothing. Neither does he satisfy our curiosity as to the necropolis of Amathus.[2] That town was on the southern coasts, and its situation, its myths, the part it played in history, its worship of Astarte, and the monuments that have been found in it, all combine to convince us that Amathus was one of those towns in which the influence of their Phœnician founders endured the longest.[3] As at Golgos and Idalion, most of the tombs belong to the decadence, but careful excavation soon brought to light a group of sepulchres, finer and more carefully constructed, according to General di Cesnola, than any others he found in the island. They are at the foot of the inclosure and outside it in a narrow valley to the north-west of the low hill upon which the town was built. They are about a hundred in number, and represent, in all probability, the burying-place of the kings and high priests of Amathus. They are now covered with earth to a depth varying between forty and fifty-four feet, and are built, paved, and roofed with large stones set in regular courses. Some of the stones are as much as twenty feet long by five feet nine inches wide and three feet four inches deep. Some of the tombs have flat (Fig. 153), others ridge (Fig. 154) roofs; all are paved with great slabs of limestone. Some have one, others two, chambers; while there are four, at least, in which the arrangement shown in our Fig. 155 has been followed. These sepulchres must have been originally built on the surface of the ground at the bottom of the valley, and then, after the corpses were put in place, deliberately buried in earth in order to render access more difficult. The

[1] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, plate xi.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 255-283.

[3] The very name of the town, which has only come down to us in its Greek form of Ἀμαθοῦς, is, perhaps, Semitic in its origin, and identical with that of Hamath, the Syrian city in the Valley of the Orontes.



FIG. 151.—Cypriot stele. Limestone. Height 33 inches. Metropolitan Museum of New York.

FIG. 152.—Cypriot stele. Metropolitan Museum of New York. Height 4 feet 10 inches.

work thus begun by their constructors was finished by the rains, which carried down stones and sand from the flanks of the neighbouring hills and heaped them upon the necropolis. The deposit



FIG. 153.—Tomb at Amathus. From Cesnola.[1]

is thickest towards the head of the valley, where the hollow is deeper and more confined than elsewhere (Fig. 156).[2]



FIG. 154.—Tomb at Amathus. From Cesnola.[1]

Here all the corpses seem to have been placed in sarcophagi. The number of the latter varies ; in some chambers only one is to

[1] *Cyprus*, p. 256.

[2] I take these details from a letter of General DI CESNOLA'S, who has been good enough to give us, from his notes and his memory, much of the information for which we looked in vain in his book. The shafts shown on his page 255 and in our Fig. 156 form no part of the tombs—they were dug by the explorers in the course of their search. A young German savant, Dr. Sigismond, who helped to decipher the Cypriot inscriptions, visited the necropolis in 1875, and met his death by falling down one of these pits.

be found, and that placed in the middle of the floor; in others there are three—one on the left, another on the right, and a third opposite to the entrance (Fig. 157). In tombs with two chambers as many as ten and even fifteen sarcophagi have been encountered. When there was no room on the floor the last comers were heaped



FIG. 155.—Plan of a tomb at Amathus. From Cesnola.[1]

on the first, so that in some cases there were two and three tiers of coffins.[2] In the sarcophagi themselves there was very great variety. In one tomb was found an anthropoid marble sarcophagus, the head on which was apparently female, and a perfectly plain limestone coffin.[3] In one of the four-chambered



FIG. 156.—Section through the ravine at Amathus.

sepulchres, in the centre of the chamber opposite the door, a fine marble sarcophagus with each of its four faces covered by reliefs within a richly carved border was found. It was broken into many pieces, but into pieces which were easily fitted together.

[1] *Cyprus*, p. 260.

[2] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, pp. 259 and 272.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 270 and 288.

The two long sides were carved with a kind of procession; four chariots drawn by horses with fan-like plumes upon their heads, and between the chariots foot-soldiers armed with lances and round shields, and a couple of horsemen. Upon each of the two short faces a single figure was repeated four times. At one end this figure was the naked goddess with bent arms and hands displaying her breasts and about her throat a double necklace; at the other the god Bes, recognizable by his feather head-dress, by his large face, and the deformity of his thickset little person.[1] The lid, too, is sumptuously decorated;[2] at each end of the central ridge a graceful palmette acts as an acroterion, while winged sphinxes face each other at the four angles.



FIG. 157.—Interior of a tomb at Amathus. From Cesnola.[3]

The doorway of the tomb in which this fine monument was found is surrounded by four grooves (Fig. 158). The height of the opening is four feet ten inches, the width three feet nine; in several more of these tombs we find doorways of the same dimensions and decorated in the same fashion.[4] The opening was closed by means of a huge and heavy stone which rested against the jambs.

[1] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, plates xiv. and xv.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 267. The lid, like the body of the coffin, was broken into many pieces. The drawing which we reproduce farther on, following Cesnola, is almost a restoration, but thanks to the exact symmetry of the design, there is nothing doubtful about it.

[3] *Cyprus*, p. 282.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 256 and 270.

Even from the little we know about it, it is clear that the necropolis is Phœnician in character. The anthropoid sarcophagi borrowed by Phœnicia from Egypt are found in it, and side by side with them the smooth stone troughs of Sidon; while on the only decorated coffin it has yielded we encounter Bes and Istar. Neither is there anything Greek among the objects found in the tombs; as on the Syrian coast, these are alabaster bottles, amulets of Egyptian fayence, terra-cotta statuettes of the naked goddess, clay vases with geometrical decorations, a wooden box with bronze incrustations, fragments of a bronze shield decorated with fights of animals and those of a silver cup with figures upon it.[1] Upon the cup the imitation of Egyptian motives may be



FIG. 158.—Doorway of a tomb at Amathus. From Cesnola.[2]

plainly traced; as for the shield it recalls objects of the same class found in Assyria.[3]

We do not think, however, that this assemblage of tombs dates from a very remote period; on one of the vases we find an attempt at representing figures, the figures of two people in a chariot; on the sarcophagus with bas-reliefs and still more on that belonging to the anthropoid class, we can trace the influence of Greek sculpture. The latest of these tombs can hardly be earlier than the fifth or even the beginning of the fourth century.

The last type of Cypriot tomb is furnished by those in the neighbourhood of Nea-Paphos, in the south of the island, in a region in which religious rites preserved their marked Oriental

[1] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, pp. 275-281, and plates xviii. xix. and xx.

[2] *Cyprus*, p. 260.

[3] *Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, vol. ii. pp. 330-347, fig. 225.

and Semitic character down to the last days of paganism. These monuments have attracted the attention of travellers ever since the beginning of the century.[1] The tombs are hollowed in the flank of a rocky hill which rises in the centre of the plain and is crowned by a plateau. Some of them have a series of chambers



FIG. 159.—Plan of a tomb at Nea-Paphos. From Ross.

in the sides of which are cut niches for bodies (Fig. 159). These are perhaps the oldest. In some more important tombs we find a very curious arrangement (Figs. 160 and 161). Each group of chambers is connected with a rectangular court, open to the sky and surrounded by square shafts and circular columns.



FIG. 160.—Plan of a tomb at Nea-Paphos. From Ross.

The court, the surrounding colonnade, the chambers attached, and the corridor by which the court is reached, are all cut in the

[1] ROSS, *Reisen nach Cypern*, pp. 187-189. *Archæologische Zeitung*, 1851, plate xxviii. figs. 3 and 4. POTTIER, *Les Hypogées doriques de Néa-Paphos dans l'île de Cypre* (*Bulletin de Correspondance héllenique*, 1880, pp. 497-505).

living rock. Under the colonnade are openings into chambers surrounded by niches, each niche made to hold a single body. It has also been thought that platforms for sarcophagi were to be recognized, but no fragment of coffin or sarcophagus, or of any sepulchral furniture, has been found in any one of these hypogea. This is not surprising, for they have for many centuries afforded a shelter to the shepherds and herdsmen of the neighbourhood from the sun and rain; the ceilings are blackened by the smoke of their fires. Their comparative architectural magnificence—for their façades have always been visible—must also have been a source of danger. They have no inscriptions to show, but what



FIG. 161.—Courtyard of a tomb at Nea-Paphos. From Ross.

is known of the fame and wealth of the Paphian sanctuary suggests a very probable explanation of their existence; they are most likely the tombs of the high priests who ministered in the neighbouring temple, and profited by the piety of its visitors.

None of these tombs can be older than the fifth century B.C. The columns with their capitals and the entablature they support are Greek in the details of their architecture; it is the Doric order, as we find it in Greece. There is even one detail which seems to hint that these colonnades are later than Alexander; the frieze is deeper than the architrave, a proportion which is not, as a rule, to be met with in buildings anterior to the Parthenon or contemporary with it. But we are justified in mentioning these

remains on this page, because although their details are Greek their plan is very different to anything we are accustomed to see in Greek tombs. We find these rock-cut quadrangles neither in Ionia nor upon the mainland of Greece; on the other hand, although none have yet been encountered in Phœnicia, several examples may be pointed to in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. The Jews were near relations to the Phœnicians and were inspired by them, and in the tombs they built we find chambers giving on to these open courts, just as they did in the dwelling-houses of antiquity, and do still in those of Damascus and the rest of Syria.

The sepulchres we have described and figured from Kition, Idalion, Golgos, Amathus, and Paphos, are the best, or rather the least ill, known of all those hitherto discovered in Cyprus. They alone demand notice here, because they alone belong to that part of the island in which the influence of Phœnicia was predominant for the longest time. But even in those districts where the mass of the population was Greek, most of the types we have described are to be encountered. In the northern and western districts, for instance, the oven-shaped tombs have been found;[1] at Curium, where that form of sepulchre occurs very often, shallow graves hollowed in the floors of the hypogea, and sarcophagi cut from blocks of living rock that have been left standing in the centre of the hollowed diameter, have also been met with.[2] On the other hand, in the whole of that part of Cyprus which was under Greek domination, neither anthropoid sarcophagi, nor those peculiar steles of which we have given so many examples, seem to have been encountered.

Finally, we must not forget to note that, in the whole of what we may call Phœnician Cyprus the tomb is as mute as on the Phœnician mainland. It is often rich in potteries and miscellaneous objects of much value, but neither upon the slab with which its entrance is closed, nor upon the steles and richly ornamented sarcophagi, is there a name or an invocation to the gods. The only exception to this rule is furnished by a stele from Athieno (Fig. 54), on which appear two Greek words written on one side in Cypriot characters, on the other in the alphabet employed by the Greek race all over their world.

In the absence of precise documents we cannot affirm that

[1] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, pp. 226 and 295. [2] *Ibid.* p. 295.

among the very ancient tombs found by Salzmann in the island of Rhodes, at Camirus and Ialysus, there were any of certain Phœnician origin; and yet some of these sepulchres reminded their finder of the tombs of Egypt. "They are composed," he tells us, "of a square well, from one side of which opens the doorway into the coffin chamber itself." In this arrangement they resemble the oldest of the tombs we have noticed on the Syrian coast. In any case, the Greeks never colonized Malta or Gozo, so that in their case we are in no danger of mistaking archaic Greek sepulchres for Phœnician burial-places.[1] The tombs of Malta and Gozo have never yet been studied as they deserve to be, but an inscription has come down to us which proves that there were Phœnician tombs in Malta.[2] It was found in a hypogeum with walls whitened with chalk. The slab on which it appears was set in the rock; it is now in the Cabinet des Médailles, at Paris. We thus have fair grounds for ascribing a Phœnician origin to the many anepigraphic tombs which have been found in other parts of the island.[3] No vessel or trinket of certain *provenance* has been found in them to which we might turn for the date; but their general arrangement agrees with what we have learnt as to the sepulchres of Phœnicia. In one, however, the chamber to which the well gives access is not rectangular, as it usually is in Cyprus and Phœnicia, but round, a form we have not hitherto encountered (Figs. 162, 163, and 164).

Nothing could be simpler or less varied than the tombs of which the vast necropolis of Carthage is composed; they are all subterranean, and are carved in the soft limestone of the *Djebel kawi*. The main tomb consists of a rectangular chamber, varying in size according to the wealth of its proprietor or the number of his family, but always arranged on the principle shown in our Figs.

[1] The manuscript journal of Salzmann's explorations is preserved in the British Museum, but the information it contains is very summary and vague, if we may judge from the fragment which has been published in the *Bulletin archéologique du Musée Parent* (No. 1, October 1867, folio, the only number of that publication which ever saw the light). Unfortunately Salzmann's paper, entitled *Une Ville homérique* (*Revue archéologique*, 2nd series, vol. iv. p. 467), has no illustrations. It is from this article (p. 468) that we quote above.

[2] *Corpus. Inscr. Semit.* pars i. No. 124. The eponymous magistrate was no doubt a local suffete.

[3] *Description of Ancient Rock Tombs at Ghain Tiffiha and Tal Horr, Malta*, by Captain JOHN S. SWANN (*Archæologia*, vol. xl. pp. 483-487).

165 and 166, which represent a tomb chosen as a type by Beulé after having visited, as he tells us, many thousands of these sepulchres.[1] A staircase about a yard wide, and consisting of nine rather steep steps, leads down to the doorway of the chamber, which is nearly seven feet high and slightly arched at the top. The walls of the staircase, like those of the tomb chamber, are covered with a hard and fine white stucco; they are, in fact, the whited sepulchres to which Christ compares the Pharisees.[2] The chamber



FIGS. 162 and 163.—Plan and section of a tomb at Malta. From the *Archæologia.*

itself, in the tomb we have taken as a type, is 22 feet 4 inches long by 10 feet 10 inches wide, and 7 feet 6 inches high. "The chief characteristic of the Carthaginian tombs is not only simplicity, but economy. All the arrangements are made so as to take up the least possible space. Only one person at a time can

[1] BEULÉ, *Fouilles à Carthage*, 4to, Paris, 1861, pp. 121-143.

[2] ST. MATTHEW, xxiii. 27. Saint Chrysostom explains the phrase of the evangelist by these words: *τάφοι κεχρισμένοι γύψῳ τε καὶ ἀσβέστῳ.*

pass through the doorway or down the steps; the ceiling is but little above the head of a man, and we shall see that the bodies themselves had no room to spare. Right and left the rock is cut into three shallow arches; these are 5 feet 10 inches wide, while the pilasters between them are from 29 to 30 inches wide at the base and stand out about 14 inches from the wall.[1] . . . . In the space embraced by each of these arcades two rectangular tunnels are cut, each 6 feet 10 inches deep, 2 feet 10 inches high, and 1 foot 10 inches wide. Such measurements just give room for a corpse to lie at length. The bodies were put in head first, as we know from the positions of the bones in the



FIG. 164.—Cross section of above tomb.

few niches that have been opened."[2] In all this we may recognize the rock-cut niches, the *fours à cercueil* or corpse-ovens which we have already encountered in Phœnicia. Their number is here increased to seventeen by the three pierced in the farthest wall of the chamber and the pair that flank the entrance. A sepulchre here and there has no more than three niches, and one or two have twenty-one; while a few have neither staircase nor doorway, properly speaking; they are reached by a mere perpendicular hole, barely large enough to admit the passage of a man's body.

[1] BEULÉ, *Fouilles à Carthage*, p. 132.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 135.

No trace of anything in the shape of a door, of hinges or sealing holes, was found. The tomb was closed in all likelihood by a heavy slab fitting exactly to the opening and kept in place by the lowest step of the staircase (Figs. 165 and 166).[1]

The niches for the bodies must also have been closed as soon as occupied. They were built up with small stones imbedded in mortar and covered either with stucco like that upon the rest of the walls, or with a smooth slab. All these niches are now open and empty. The necropolis of Carthage has always been so accessible that it has been more completely sacked than even the cemeteries on the Syrian coast. It was pillaged in antiquity by the legionaries of Scipio and the Roman colonists of Caius Gracchus and Cæsar; for many centuries past it has been used as a quarry for lime. Everything has been carried away, both objects deposited in the niches and chambers, and sepulchral inscriptions. It would seem that formerly the latter were very numerous; it is said that beneath each niche a little slab was fixed giving the name of the occupant. We are told that the holes by means of which these slabs were fixed are still quite visible, and that they are so small in diameter and so precisely cut that they could hardly have been used for anything but bronze plaques. The use of that valuable material would account for the total disappearance of the slabs.[2]

Until more complete excavations or some fortunate chance brings one of the slabs to light, we cannot affirm that these niches bore the names of those by whom they were occupied, an arrangement which never existed, or at least which has left no trace of its existence, in the cemeteries of Phœnicia proper. The great peculiarity of the Carthaginian necropolis is its freedom from those differences which are so striking when we pass from one town to another, or from one period to another, in a cemetery on the Syrian coast or in Cyprus. Here we find no pyramids or other salient features rising above the ground, as at Arvad and

[1] BEULÉ, *Fouilles à Carthage*, pp. 129-131.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 137. BEULÉ'S evidence on this point is very clear, but it is curious that among so many plaques not one should have been recovered, either in place and under some fall of earth, or upon the floor and hidden by the *débris* with which most of the chambers are so deeply encumbered that it is impossible to stand up in them. Here is an opportunity for some explorer with more time at his command than Beulé could afford.

in the country about Tyre; no mummy-cases as at Sidon, or sarcophagi covered with reliefs, as at Amathus; no moulded steles, or winged lions and sphinxes, as at Golgos; nothing but the nudity of well-whitened walls and the monotony of arrangements that never varied in any essential particular. In all this we



FIG. 165.—Plan of a Carthaginian tomb. From Beulé.

must not see the effect of police regulation or of hieratic prescription; it is sufficiently explained by the very history of Carthage. In comparison with the cities of Phœnicia and the island of Cyprus, Carthage was a modern town; she had no archaic period. Add to this that she was in Africa, far enough away from Egypt,



FIG. 166.—Section of a Carthaginian tomb. From Beulé.

Assyria, and Greece; the influence of the great national arts of those three countries did not press upon her too closely and directly; she had fewer types and motives offered to her for imitation than Phœnicia, and took even less pains to invent. The Tyrian colonists, by whom Carthage was founded, brought

from their mother-city the habit of disposing of their dead in niches cut in the living rock; the nature of the soil allowed them to be faithful to the custom of their fathers, and they were faithful; for five centuries the workmen whom they employed to prepare and decorate their tombs reproduced the same arrangement with unswerving patience; we could hardly have a better proof of the poverty of the Carthaginian genius, or of the dryness of the national imagination.

But if wealthy Carthage was satisfied to repeat a single type of sepulchre down to the very last days of her independent life, the Phœnician colonies in Sardinia offer more variety.[1] In that island there were towns of different origin and very different age. Some were founded by the Tyrians when they set about providing naval stations and ports of call for ships on their way to Spain, others were not born or, at least, developed until the years of the Punic supremacy. This tomb may be the property of a Syrian merchant, that of a Carthaginian; the majority must have belonged to those colonists who left Carthage to settle in the towns of the south and west and in the country about them. In face of this variety in the population it is, then, not a thing to surprise us that the principal variants on the Phœnician tomb as we described it in Syria should be found in Sardinia, or even that a few forms should be encountered which are not to be met with elsewhere.

The Phœnician tombs of Sardinia are rock-cut. As a rule they consist of a chamber reached by several steps (Figs. 167, 168); but in the cemeteries of Caralis and Tharros we find more than one example of sepulchres in which access to the chamber is by a rectangular well with steps cut in its sides.[2] The mouths of these

[1] In speaking of Sardinia we shall take for our constant guide Signor ETTORE PAIS. His paper entitled *La Sardegna Prima del Dominio Romano* (4to, Rome, 1881,) is a model of sober judgment and precise science; it will be found in the Transactions of the *Reale Accademia dei Lincei*. The canon SPANO began to draw attention to the antiquities discovered in Sardinia, and to keep an exact note of the discoveries; his *Bulletino Archæologico Sardo* (1855-1861), which has rendered great services in its time, may still be consulted with advantage. La Marmora, Elena, Cara, and Crespi, whose works we shall have to quote more than once before the end of these volumes, have also brought together many valuable data; but Pais was the first to bring a sufficient critical education to bear on the question. He makes short work of many illusions and mistakes into which his predecessors had fallen.

[2] ETTORE PAIS, *La Sardegna Prima del Dominio Romano*, p. 86. Those who

wells, which are sometimes surrounded by a low wall of loose stones, are from twenty to twenty-four feet deep. They are often shaped like a rectangular chimney (Fig. 169), but sometimes their vertical section is that of several truncated pyramids placed one upon another (Figs. 170 and 171). Upon their walls we may still trace here and there such emblems as the *crux ansata* and the disk and crescent. After a funeral these wells were filled with rubble. Now and then we find two chambers, not *en suite*, but one above the other, and opening into the same well but at different levels. In these chambers with wells the dead were, as a rule, placed with their feet towards the door.[1]

This is the most ancient form of all, the least removed from the Egyptian prototype, so that we are not surprised to meet with it on



FIG. 167.—Plan of a tomb at Sulcis. From La Marmora.[2]

the shores of the fine anchorage of Calaris, now Cagliari. This harbour opens to the south-east close to the southernmost point of

desire more circumstantial details of these Sardinian tombs may consult the following works with advantage: A. DELLA MARMORA, *Voyage en Sardaigne et Itinéraire de l'île de Sardaigne pour faire Suite au Voyage dans cette Contrée*, 5 vols. 8vo, 1839-1860, and folio of plates without date. The part dealing specially with antiquities is vol. ii. with the forty plates in the second part of the *Atlas*. On many pages of the *Itinéraire*, too, information of more recent date is given. V. CRESPI, *Catalogo Illustrato della Raccolta di Antichità Sarde Possedute dal Signor Raimondo Chessa* (4to, Cagliari, 1868, 157 pp. and 8 plates), pp. 114, 115, 147, 150-157. ELENA, *Scavi nella Necropoli Occidentale di Cagliari* (Cagliari, 4to, 1868, 1 plate). It is unfortunately difficult to procure these curious and interesting works outside the island. I owe my ability to refer to them to the kindness of MM. Pais and Crespi.

[1] ELENA, *Scavi*, &c. p. 15.

[2] *Atlas*, part ii. plate 35.

the island. It was directly in the way of ships steering towards Spain from Sicily or Africa. Nowhere else could a safer anchorage or a finer stretch of country in its neighbourhood be found. When the Tyrians began to visit Sardinia it was here, no doubt, that their first foot was planted, and that they founded a city which has remained the capital of the island ever since. As for Tharros, we know nothing of its history,[1] but its situation too was very advantageous; the broad haven that lies beneath it looks out to the Balearic Isles and the distant coast of Spain. It was here, perhaps, that the ships of Tarshish broke their long voyages both outwards and homewards, and took in food and water. We are



FIG 168.—Section of a tomb at Sulcis. From La Marmora.

inclined, therefore, to believe in a high antiquity for Tharros; in any case, the extent of its cemetery and the richness of the deposits it inclosed prove that the city had a long and brilliant period of prosperity. Down to 1851 the chambers in which its dead took their rest were almost untouched, but in that year the excavations began, and in the necropolis of Tharros most of the objects which fill the museums of modern Sassari and Cagliari were found. Private collections in the island can show many more objects from the

[1] Before the recent discoveries the town of Tharros was only known from Ptolemy's geography, and from the existence of a Roman milestone on which the distance between Tharros and Cornus is marked. In Ptolemy's manuscripts the word is written Tharras; the form Tharros appears in the Latin text.

same place, and some have found their way into the great museums of Europe. Unhappily Sardinia, like Cyprus, has not been explored on any strict system, so that it is now impossible to find out which things came from which tomb.[1] The cemetery of Tharros was pillaged rather than explored or studied; now that it has been placed under the guardianship of zealous and competent men, few discoveries are made in it; it is, in fact, exhausted, or nearly so.

In the absence of drawings made on the spot and of circumstantial narratives, it is very difficult to form a clear idea of the



FIG. 169.—Tomb at Cagliari. From Elena.

tombs from which so many interesting monuments have been taken. Thus we know that many of the sepulchres at Tharros have an external salient member, which is sometimes a pyramidion (Fig. 172), sometimes a small hemispherical dome (Fig. 143), but

[1] ETTORE PAIS, *La Sardegna*, pp. 86, 87. SPANO tells us that the chambers excavated in the rock were from 6 to 10 feet below the surface, and from 6 to 10 feet high (*Bullettino*, vol. vii. p. 184). The most complete work on the ruins of Tharros is SPANO'S *Notizie sull' antica Città di Tharros*, reprinted at the end of the seventh volume of the *Bullettino*. See also LA MARMORA'S *Itinéraire*, pp. 574-609. Care must be taken, however, to reject all the statements borrowed by Spano and La Marmora from those *Codici d'Arborea* of which the authenticity is now generally denied.

we are told nothing as to the size of these features; we are allowed to gather that they stood before the tombs, the entrances to which were closed generally by a slab of sandstone, but sometimes by a brick wall. We are no better informed in the case of a curious



FIGS. 170, 171.—Sections of a tomb at Cagliari. From Crespi.

monumental group discovered in the same cemetery (Fig. 174), a large rectangular stele, decorated on its face with a disk and crescent moon in relief; right and left a pyramidal cippus with a double



FIG. 172.—Funerary Cippus from Tharros. From Spano.

moulding about its summit. All three of these columns stand upon a single base. The central stele is crowned either by a pediment or a pyramidion which stands out slightly beyond the line of its face. This same triangular crown appears on those cippi on which

we find the names of deceased persons (Fig. 175).[1] We do not know that any sarcophagi, anthropoid or otherwise, have been



FIGS. 173, 174.—Cippi from tombs at Tharros. From Spano.

found in the Sardinian cemeteries, but fragmentary coffins of cypress or juniper have been encountered.[2] In some cases there

FIG. 175.—Sandstone cippus with Phœnician inscription. Height 31 inches.

is no trace of a coffin, but the dead were always surrounded, in the tomb, with objects of various kinds, some of them amulets,

[1] *Corpus Inscrip. Semit.* pars i. No. 159.

[2] PAIS, *La Sardegna*, p. 86, note 1. ELENA, *Scavi*, p. 18. CRESPI, *Catalogo*, p. 154.

others, utensils for use in the subterranean life after death. Thus we often find amphoræ standing in the corner of the chamber,

FIG. 176.—Interior of a tomb at Tharros. From Spano.

their mouths closed with clay. On opening them a deposit is discovered such as would be left by wine which had slowly

FIG. 177.—Statuette in glazed earthenware. From Crespi.

evaporated. In nearly every sepulchre lamps are placed either by the corpse or in niches hollowed in the walls (Fig. 176).[1]

[1] ELENA, *Scavi*, p. 19.

Among amulets we shall place those figures of tutelary deities, those statuettes of terra-cotta or glazed earthenware which, as a rule, suggest Egyptian types.[1] As examples we figure the hawk-headed deity with his arms close to his sides and the small elongated cube with figures on three of its faces. Of these one resembles Bes, another the pygmy god who has been identified with Ptah, while the third presents a rarer type; that of a nude and winged goddess with her legs ending in the body of a serpent. Above

FIG. 178.—Amulet in glazed earthenware. From Crespi.

her head appears the solar disk between two pendant wings (Fig. 178). We may also note a woman's head with an Egyptian head-dress (Fig. 179), which formed part of a necklace, and a great variety of scarabs (Fig. 180); sometimes a sow takes the place of a scarab, but even here the under side of the base on which that animal stands is engraved with Egyptian symbols (Fig. 181). Even the *oudja*, or mystical eye of Osiris, is not absent (Fig. 182). On the reverse of this latter amulet a group is

FIG. 179.—Glass amulet. From Crespi.



FIG. 180.—Scarab. From Spano.

carved which was a favourite in Egypt, namely, a cow suckling her calf.[2] Finally, the necropolis of Tharros has afforded several specimens of those light gold and silver sheaths, or *étuis*, in which

[1] CRESPI (*Catalogo*, p. 28) tells us that these amulets of glazed or white earthenware, of glass, of ivory, and of soft or hard stone, were found in the tombs in thousands.

[2] LEPSIUS, *Denkmæler*, part ii. plates 31 and 77. Elsewhere (plates 12 and 46) one finds a goat with a fawn's head.

were inclosed thin plates of the same metals rolled round cylinders of gilded bronze. These plates are engraved with texts which have not yet been deciphered ; the plates are to some extent disfigured, and the writing upon them is extremely fine, as if written with the help of a magnifying glass. The characters on one of these metal bands are certainly Phœnician ; on others they

FIG. 181.—Scarab in form of a Sow. From Spano.

FIG. 182.—Amulet in white earthenware, glazed. From Crespi.

belong apparently to that alphabet of Saffa which was used by the southern Shemites, the Arabs, towards the commencement of the Christian era. In time, no doubt, all these inscriptions will be deciphered ; it is probable that they will be found to be magic formulæ intended to protect the dead against the attempts of demons or the violence of tomb-breakers. We figure two of the *étuis* (Figs. 183 and 184). One is decorated with a lion's head,

FIGS. 183, 184.—Etuis found in the tombs. From Spano.

the other with that of a hawk. The ring that appears on them both suggests that these sheaths were hung round the necks of the corpses ; it is even possible that they were worn in that fashion during life.[1]

[1] Upon these little sheaths and their contents see SPANO, *Bullettino*, vol. iv. pp. 33-36. CARA, *Iscrizioni fenicie sopra Monumenti della Sardegna che appartengono al R. Museo in Cagliari*, p. 29. Another *étui* found at Tharros is crowned by a

As for things meant for use, such as jewels and earthenware vessels, we shall find another opportunity for describing them. The cemetery of Tharros has furnished several fine vases painted in the Greek style, and a considerable number of black glaze vases which seem to be of Etruscan manufacture.[1] But these are fewer in number than the vessels of grey pottery decorated with stars and parallel bands of red paint. This decoration recalls that of the Cypriot vases, which the vessels on which it is used also greatly resemble in shape.[2] Asiatic art is again suggested in the motives and executive details of the jewelry.

The more closely we examine the objects found in the graveyards of Sardinia the more certain do we become of the profound influence exercised by the Shemites of Western Asia over their production. Sardinia became, and remained for ages, more thoroughly Phœnician even than Cyprus, in spite of the situation of the latter island close to the coast of Syria. The Greeks never won a footing in it. About the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. commerce may, indeed, have introduced a few objects of luxury bought in Greece or Etruria; but such imports were few and far between, and had little or no effect upon the tastes and habits of the Sardinian population. All that the latter had of civilization, of art and industry, they drew, first from Tyre, secondly from Carthage, and these intimate relations endured for a thousand years. The important place we have here given to Sardinia need, therefore, cause no surprise; she would, indeed, have filled a much larger space in our inquiry had we possessed more copious and more accurate information. Down to the Roman conquest Sardinia was hardly more than a dependency, a prolongation, so to speak, of Asiatic Phœnicia. And this character she only lost very slowly under the rule of the Roman prætors. Even now, we are told,

human head. It is published by EUTING, in plate xxxvii. of the important study contributed by him to the *Mémoires de l'Académie de Saint-Pétersbourg*, seventh series, vol. xvii. An object of the same kind was found at Malta (PAIS, *La Sardegna*, &c., p. 88, No. 3). RENAN mentions some very similar objects found at Saïda. "On these," he says, "Hebrew characters of a debased period may be read; they repeat the names of the deity, probably with some Cabalistic intention" (*Mission*, p. 393). Even at Rome objects very like these, at least in external shape, have been discovered (*Bullettino di Correspondenza Archeologico*, 1880, p. 114). Their use seems therefore to have been very widespread, and to have lasted very long.

[1] PAIS, *La Sardegna*, p. 90 and No. 3.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 90.

the customs and superstitions of the peasantry show traces of the habits and beliefs which ruled during the period whose monuments we have just been describing; the Syrian cult of Adonis has left its mark, it is thought, on more than one popular Sardinian festival.[1]

Some day, perhaps, the remains of the hardy mariners of Phœnicia will be found on coasts which at present seem to have preserved no souvenir of their visits. Such discoveries may help us to a solution of some minor problems, but they will hardly modify the results already obtained in any material degree. We are now well acquainted with the Phœnician tomb. Ill preserved as it is in nearly every instance, it allows us to point out certain permanent features, which we may here recapitulate. The Phœnicians never burned their dead; from first to last they placed them underground. With the passage of time natural grottoes were superseded by artificial chambers cut from the rock *ad hoc*. In these every variety of sepulchral bed is to be found; a ledge raised a few inches above the floor of the chamber or a trough sunk in its centre, sarcophagi, both fixed and movable, plain and decorated, and sometimes like the Egyptian mummy cases in form; finally and especially, the oven-shaped niche excavated in the chamber wall, a receptacle which combined the great advantages of requiring no coffin and of leaving the chamber itself free for the celebration of funerary rites, and for the easy passage of future corpses to the places reserved for them in the family sepulchre. The marked predilection shown by the Phœnicians for this method of entombment was in strict harmony with their practical and utilitarian genius; they sought for economy in every thing they did; they hated all unnecessary expenditure of time, effort, or money. It is, perhaps, to this trait in their character that the absence of funerary inscriptions is to be traced. What was the use, they may have said, of engraving epitaphs in those secret and walled up chambers, which would never again be entered after the last niche was filled? When the Phœnicians found themselves in a country where sepulchres on the surface of the soil were used, and attention called to them by an external tombstone, they conformed to that usage. Look, for instance, at the epitaphs of the Sidonian merchants who died at Athens. These are often engraved both in Greek and Phœnician. The Semitic reticence is exchanged for

[1] PAIS, *La Sardegna*, p. 97, and No. 5.

the frankness of the Greek ; the marble tells us the names of the dead, of his father and of his country, sometimes his quality or profession, as in the epitaph which reads :

"I am Asepta, daughter of Esmounchillem, and a Sidonian. This mounment was raised to me by Iatanbel, son of Esmounsilleh, high priest of the god Nergal."

CHAPTER IV.

SACRED ARCHITECTURE.

§ 1.—*The Temple in Phœnicia.*

The earliest form of religion practised by those Canaanitish and Semitic tribes who peopled Syria was that of the high places so often mentioned in the Bible. At the time of their first arrival in the country their creed was fetishism. Their worship and respect were given to those natural objects and phenomena which made the deepest impression on their eyes and imaginations, to the clear and refreshing springs at which they quenched their thirst and to the torrent whose noise and turbulence oppressed their spirits, to trees, to mountains whose sides were covered with forests and whose heads were often lost in clouds. In a country in which plains were of small extent, where chains of mountains rise on every horizon, a mountain especially was a great fetish, and what could be more natural than to do it honour by erecting an altar of sacrifice on its summit? And with time another idea may have come to mingle with this; when the conception of personal or semi-personal deities first sprang up and they were given a dwelling-place in the skies, men thought that by climbing hills they brought themselves near the homes of the gods. From the high summits which commanded the country and the long length of coast, the smoke of the sacrifice and the prayers of the officiating priest would have a shorter distance to travel before they reached the ears and the nostrils of the divinity to whom they were addressed.

Whatever the original cause of this form of worship may have been it was always of an extreme simplicity. Of this we have a proof in a curious passage of Tacitus, who tells us—and he is

confirmed by Suetonius—that during his sojourn in Palestine Vespasian went to consult the oracle of Mount Carmel. "Carmel," he says, "is on the borders of Judæa and Syria; the mountain and the god have the same name. The god has neither statue nor temple, for such is the tradition; he has only a much venerated altar."[1] The only sign of man in the place was the altar of rough stones, like that built in the same place by Elijah when he wished to confound the false prophets of Baal.[2] A sacrifice could be offered, in the words of the Jewish writer, "on every high hill, and under every green tree."[3] In the Græco-Roman period, when it was desired to decorate these high places with architecture, men were content to build a colonnade round their summits. At Belat, to the south of Tyre, traces of one of these ancient sanctuaries have been found. A laurel wood, which decorates and partly hides the ruins with its foliage, must be the remains of the sacred grove by which the altar was once surrounded.[4]

In this open-air worship there was nothing to favour the progress of sculpture or architecture; the god had neither home nor image; but the Phœnicians had much communication with Egypt, and imported the idea of the temple from her. The only temple which still exists on the soil of Phœnicia is nothing more than the reduction of an Egyptian shrine adapted to the soil and habits of its new country. We are here referring to the building called by the dwellers in its neighbourhood *El-Maabed*, or "the temple." As in the buildings of the Nile valley the essential part, the heart and centre of the whole, is a stone tabernacle or monolithic chapel, in which either an image or symbol of the divinity was enshrined.[5] We have already given a plan (Fig. 39) and a view (Fig. 40) of the building as a whole, but we have yet to describe the arrangements of this small cella, which is closed on three sides and open towards the valley, like the building by which it is surrounded.[6] The tabernacle is composed of four stones, three of which are interposed between the mass of living rock, which

[1] TACITUS, *History*, ii. 78. SUETONIUS, *Vespasian*, 5.
[2] 1 *Kings* xviii. 30-32.
[3] 1 *Kings* xiv. 23.
[4] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 687. Cf. pp. 691, 692.
[5] See *Art in Ancient Egypt*, Vol. I. Ch. IV. § 3.
[6] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 63-68, and plate x.

forms the foundation, and the roof, which is a monolith. The anterior edge of the roof comes forward as far as the rock foundation, forming a kind of awning which was, we may guess, supported originally by metal columns. A glance at our section (Fig. 185) will show how bold and well marked this salience is.

The arrangements of this small open chamber are peculiar in more ways than one. In the interior the ceiling is a flat arch, while the projection in front is hollowed underneath into three oblong coffers.



FIG. 185.—The Maabed at Amrith. From Renan.

The floor of the chamber slopes from back to front, and at each side there are two ledges about thirty-two inches apart.[1] In front of each of the door jambs there is a shallow square hole (C and D), which must have been used to receive either the bases of a pair of columns, or those of candelabra or some other ornament of the kind (Fig. 187). Several more shallow cavities are to be

[1] GERHARD sees in these ledges a double throne. Such an hypothesis hardly seems probable, however. Seated face to face like this two sacred images would only present their sides to the spectator. Gerhard was obliged to depend upon very inaccurate drawings for his knowledge of all these Phœnician buildings, and in spite of his penetration he was often misled by them (*Ueber die Kunst der Phoenizier*, p. 5).

traced in the salient part of the roof. Finally, at about three-quarters of the height, inside, and near the anterior edge of the lateral walls, there is, on each side of the doorway, a hole about fifteen centimetres deep and ten square (B in Fig. 185). These two holes seem, from their size and position, to have been meant



FIG. 186.—Ceiling of the Maabed at Amrith. From Renan.

to receive an iron or wooden bar for a curtain by which the interior of the sanctuary could be protected from profane eyes.

"The tabernacle is about twenty-four feet high. Its general aspect is Egyptian, but Egyptian with a difference. The fillet and cornice on four of the edges of the monolithic roof are its only ornament. This severity of style, and the notion of force aroused



FIG. 187.—The Maabed at Amrith. Plan at A B (Fig. 185). From Renan.

by the huge materials employed, are characteristics similar to those we have already noticed in speaking of the sepulchral monuments of Amrith.

"The four walls of the rock which serves as a base to the edifice are smooth for the upper two-thirds of their height; the

lower third, on the other hand, presents the appearance of rock which has long been lapped by water. This circumstance, added to the actual existence of a spring whose waters now escape through the boundary wall, leads us to suppose that, when the north face was shut in with a wall, the inclosure formed a vast basin, in the middle of which the tabernacle rose like a 'holy of holies.'" [1]

The surface of the inclosure now has the aspect of a rough meadow. A thick layer of earth has been gradually deposited above the carefully levelled rock, but at the depth of a foot water is reached. Three sides of the inclosure are walled in by barriers of living rock, about seventeen feet high at their highest parts. It is probable that where their height was deficient it was supplemented originally by masonry. The floor of the courtyard is on the same level as the valley of the *Nahr-Amrith*, on which it opens on its northern face. We may suppose that this side, too, was formerly closed by a wall with one or several doors. A few blocks are still in place, but a thick growth of arbutus has sprung up on the site and hides all that may remain of the ancient wall.

At many points on the inner surface of these inclosing walls shallow cavities are sunk into the rock; they were once filled, no doubt, with votive steles. Side by side with them we also find niches rounded at the top.[2] Higher up in the wall there are some smaller and deeper cavities; these are square, and they seem to have been cut to receive the ends of beams. This conjecture is confirmed by the fact that at the four angles of the *enceinte* the traces of square piers or columns are still to be found. Standing away about twelve feet from the wall, these would help numerous intermediate shafts of lighter construction to support the roof of an open gallery or arcade, the cross timbers of which would be fixed, at one end, in the holes above mentioned.

The *Maabed* of Amrit is the only temple built by the Semitic race of which Syria has any important remains to show. There is every reason to believe it more ancient than the monuments of the same kind in Cyprus, Gozo, and Malta, of which we shall presently have to speak. "Nowhere else do we get such clear

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 64, 65.

[2] See the view of part of this courtyard at the foot of plate x. in the *Atlas* of the *Mission de Phénicie*.

indications of the religious habits of these peoples. The arrangements of the building clearly point to an ark or tabernacle analogous to the ark of the Hebrews and destined to hold sacred objects, a sort of *kaaba*,[1] with its *haram*, or reserved inclosure, in which all the precious objects of the nation were grouped. Perhaps steles, or metal slabs, inscribed with the religious laws of the nation, were deposited there. . . . In any case, we may guess that these cellæ were called *theba*—"ark"—by the Phœnicians, as well as by the Hebrews, and that all the more because this word, like the object itself, appears to be Egyptian in its origin. . . . Here, as in the tabernacle of the Jews, metal ornaments and precious stuffs seem to have been lavished."[2]

The *Maabed* has been seen by all the travellers who have visited that part of the Syrian coast, but the minute exploration which M. Renan made of the whole site of Amrit led to the discovery of the remains of two more tabernacles previously unknown. They stand in a laurel brake near the spring known as the *Ain-el-Hayât*, or *fountain of serpents*.[3] The better preserved of the two is broken into seven or eight fragments. After having measured the pieces and made a separate drawing of each, M. Thobois succeeded in making a restoration, in which nothing was left to conjecture (Fig. 188). The chapel in question was a monolith. It was carried on a cubical block ten feet square, which, in its turn, stood on a base composed of two huge stones, which raised it above the level of the marsh. The surface of this base was considerable smaller than that of the block of stone it supported; so that the latter overhung it on all four sides to the extent of about a yard. On two sides of the larger rock the remains of a flight of steps, leading to the platform of the cella, might be traced. The cella itself, which was about eighteen feet high, was crowned with one of those cornices made up of uræi of which we have already given the details (Fig. 61). The ceiling of the tabernacle was a flattened arch like that of the *Maabed*, but its plainness was relieved by two great pairs of wings sculptured upon it; the one having for centre the globe flanked by two uræi; the other, apparently, an eagle's head.

About five-and-thirty feet to the east of the tabernacle just

[1] *Kaaba* means a building in the shape of a cube.

[2] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 67.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 68-70, and plate ix.

described stand the base and lower parts of another; of this enough has not been recovered to justify a complete restoration, but there is sufficient to dispel all doubt as to the strong resemblance that must have existed between the two monuments.



FIG. 188.—Monolithic tabernacle of Aïn-el-Hayât. From Renan.

The general Egyptian character, the small flights of steps giving access to the cella, are conspicuous in both. Their position, too, face to face and not far apart, shows that they formed parts of a single whole; one of the two may have been consecrated to a god, and the other to his corresponding goddess. It is likely that in



FIG. 189.—Plan of the two tabernacles at Aïn-el-Hayât. From Renan.

antiquity, as now, the feet of both monuments stood in water. They would thus be protected from profane hands, which could only reach them by means of a boat, which we may be sure would not be at the order of the first comer. May we not even suppose

that in this arrangement a souvenir of those lakes which were so conspicuous in the temples of the Nile valley is to be traced?[1]

The most interesting rites and religious buildings in Phœnicia were those of Byblos.[2] Byblos was a holy city, a city of pilgrimage rather than a mercantile centre.[3] She came under the influence of Egypt more than any other town in Phœnicia, and her rites had at once a singular resemblance to the rites of the Hebrews and to those practised in the Nile valley. They involved, for instance, the use of a portable temple, or ark, dragged by oxen, which seems to have been quite similar to that of the Jews,[4] while it reminds us not a little of the portable shrines of the Egyptians.[5] The temples of Byblos must have been among those which, towards the end of the second century of our era, seemed to the author of the treatise, *On the Syrian Goddess*, to have a very ancient look.[6] The most important of them all was that in which those mystic and sensual rites of Adonis were celebrated which became so popular in the East under the successors of Alexander; unfortunately we only know its plan from medals of the Roman epoch, but a few figures of animals, fragmentary reliefs, and decorative details have survived to our time (Fig. 19).[7]

The building as shown on these medals is composed of two distinct parts. On the left there is a cella surmounted by a triangular pediment, the whole differing in no way from what Vitruvius calls a temple *in antis;* on the right there is a vast courtyard surrounded by a portico. In the centre of this court rises the conical stone, in which the god is symbolized; it is surrounded by a protecting balustrade. The area of the courtyard, which is higher than the surrounding country is reached by a wide

[1] See *Art in Ancient Egypt*, Vol. X. p. 348 and 438.

[2] We make use of the two forms Gebal and Byblos indifferently. Βύβλος results from an alteration in the Greek period, by which γ was changed into β (βλέφαρον = γλέφαρον). Even at the Roman period the natives called their town Gebal. It is curious that the primitive form should have survived in the modern *Gebeïl* or *Gebeyl*.

[3] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 215.

[4] Ἀγρὸς . . . οὗ καὶ ξόανον εἶναι μάλα σεβάσμιον, καὶ ναὸν ζυγοφορούμενον ἐν Φοινίκῃ. PHILO of BYBLOS, p. 20 of Orelli's edition.

[5] *Art in Ancient Egypt*, Vol. I. p. 352, Figs. 209, 210.

[6] The writer in question quotes, in fact, the temple of Aphrodite at Byblos as appearing almost as old as the Egyptian temples (§ 2-9).

[7] Lions seem to have been numerous at Byblos. See in *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. p. 2, those found with the stele of Jehaw-Melek.

flight of steps ending in a pillared propylæum. The lateral temple must date from the Seleucid epoch, or even later; the really old and primitive part of the whole structure, the part which justifies the words of the Pseudo-Lucian, is the cloister with its cone. It will be seen that the general arrangement is similar to that at Amrit. The chief difference lies in the fact that the arcade is backed by a wall and not by rock; the massive chapel of Amrit is replaced by the symbolic cone; the principle is the same, but at Byblos the sacred emblem is set in the open air, while at Amrit it is protected by a shrine.

The Pseudo-Lucian speaks also of a building which he reached "after a day's journey into the Lebanon from Byblos," as one of the oldest of Phœnician temples.[1] This excursion its chronicler was only able to make by following the waters of the River Adonis, now the *Nahr-Ibrahim*, up their valley, which was then "a sort of territory sacred to Adonis, filled with shrines and temples devoted to his worship."[2] At many points between Byblos and Aphaca "tombs of Adonis" were pointed out, cenotaphs analogous to those "holy sepulchres," which were so common in Catholic cities in the middle ages. But in spite of what this intelligent and attentive traveller tells us, it is doubtful whether any of these buildings date back to a really very distant age. The upper valleys of the Lebanon do not appear to have been opened to Phœnician civilization till very late. M. Renan, indeed, found some interesting ruins in the gorge of the *Nahr-Ibrahim*, but they all date from the Roman period.[3] At *Machnaka*, at *Gineh*, at *Afka*, the ancient *Aphaca* (Fig. 18), at *Sanouh*, both sculpture and architecture bear unmistakable marks of the decadence. Perhaps some of these buildings were copied in their plan and general arrangements from some of the oldest temples on the coast, a proceeding which would, of course, be likely to lead a foreign traveller to wrong conclusions.[4]

Among the great temples which he calls ancient and thinks to

[1] *Upon the Syrian Goddess*, § 9.

[2] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 295.

[3] *Mission*, l. ii. ch. iii.

[4] After declaring that the Egyptians were the inventors both of the religion and of the temples, the writer adds: Καὶ ἔστιν ἱρὰ καὶ ἐν Συρίῃ οὐ παρὰ πολὺ τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοισι ἰσοχρονέοντα, τῶν ἐγὼ πλεῖστα ὄπωπα. He then enumerates the buildings which appeared to him to belong to that category, and he concludes with these words: Τάδε μέν ἐστι τὰ ἐγ τῇ Συρίῃ ἀρχαῖα καὶ μεγάλα ἱρά (§ 2-9).

be as old as those of Egypt, the Pseudo-Lucian also counts those of Astarte at Sidon and Melkart at Tyre, the latter the temple admired by Herodotus;[1] but nothing now remains of either one or the other, and archæologists are not even agreed as to where they stood.

And here we must find space to mention a ruin which is to be found in the immediate neighbourhood of Sidon (Fig. 190), near the village of Rouméli. Part of it the villagers have turned into a stable for cattle, by filling up the space under a wide lintel and between two curiously-carved piers with a rough stone wall. The forms of these piers and of the lintel are shown in our woodcut. The lintel is about fifteen feet long. The sculptured objects which stand in the niches are too worn and broken to permit any conjecture as to what they originally represented. From



FIG. 190.—Ruin in the neighbourhood of Sidon. From Renan.

certain appearances it is clear that the present arrangement of these objects is not of any great antiquity. Most likely the two piers and the lintel originally belonged to some temple now destroyed, and, if we may accept that hypothesis, they afford another proof of the influence of Egyptian examples.

We know very little of the internal arrangement and furnishing of the Phœnician temple. In the fifteen-line inscription on the stele of Jehaw-Melek, king of Byblos (Fig. 23), the works he undertook in the temple of the "mistress of Gebal," for the purpose of conciliating her favour, are mentioned apparently;[2] but unhappily the text has suffered greatly, and most of the suggested restorations are open to grave doubt. Three things alone appear to be certain. In the first place there was, either in

[1] HERODOTUS, ii. 44.

[2] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. No. 1.

the temple itself or its precinct, a bronze altar.[1] Secondly, gold was largely employed in the decoration of the building;[2] thirdly, it had a portico and columns.[3] As for whether Jehaw-Melek boasts of having raised these supports or only of their embellishment we cannot say. All that we can clearly deduce from this much injured inscription agrees perfectly well with what we have learnt elsewhere as to the religious architecture of Phœnicia. The bronze altar reminds us of all those works in the same metal which were carried out for Solomon by the Tyrian founders under the direction of Hiram, and particularly of the "brazen sea;" the temple at Jerusalem shone with gold in mass and in thin leaves laid upon ornaments and panels; and even at Tyre itself, did not Herodotus find his admiration stirred by a great stele of pure gold on the threshold of the temple of Melkart?[4] and accord-



FIG. 191.—Stone altar. From Renan.

ing to all appearances the portico to which Jehaw-Melek alludes in his inscription is identical with the structure represented on the imperial coins of Byblos (Fig. 58).

Jehaw-Melek says nothing about the form of his bronze altar, but perhaps we may be permitted to guess that it was the prototype of an altar of peculiar form of which many examples have been encountered at Gebal and in its neighbourhood (Fig. 191).[5] In the same district altars have been found with an ornament round their summits which recalls the crenellations of Assyria (Fig. 78); as for the columns which rose in pairs, like the Egyptian obelisks, at the doors of the Phœnician temples, it is easy to understand why they have left no traces. Even when of stone they were fragile and defenceless, while when they were

[1] Line 4. [2] Lines 4 and 5. [3] Line 6.
[4] HERODOTUS, ii. 44. [5] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 229.

made of bronze, or of wood cased in bronze, they were predestined to certain destruction. Their existence, therefore, is only known to us through the ancient writers and their forms through coins and reliefs; we may say the same of the tripods, candelabra, and other objects of the same kind which made up the furnishing of the temples (Figs. 81, 82 and 83). This furnishing must have been rich The crowded cities and narrow territory of Phœnicia left no room for colossal constructions like those of Egypt and Mesopotamia, but, on the other hand, a nation of skilful workers and of merchants through whose hands passed all the commerce of the Mediterranean, had every facility for accumulating precious objects of every kind in her sanctuaries. The Phœnicians were very pious. When we attempt a classification in order of subject of the epigraphic texts they have left us, we find that by far the fullest category is that which is made up of votive inscriptions. These all conclude with the same formula, they are all constructed after the following model, which comes from the Maltese monument represented in our Fig. 28.

"To our Lord Melkart, master of Tyre; the offering of thy servants Abdosir and his brother Osirsamar, both sons of Osirsamar, who was the son of Abdosir; *because he has listened to their voice; may he bless them.*"

These steles, like the stele of Jehaw-Melek (Fig. 23) and more than one stele from Carthage (Figs 13, 15, 16 and 192) often bear on their upper part, above the inscription, a bas-relief representing sometimes a group of worshippers making offerings to a god, sometimes a worshipper alone; in most cases, however, the latter is understood and the sculptor has been content to figure the deity only.[1] At the apex of the stele appears an open hand, the symbol of prayer. Some of these steles have no inscriptions (Figs. 193 and 194). Sometimes they were not content with a simple stele. The discoveries which have been made in Cyprus in these latter years have furnished the elements of instructive comparisons and have helped us to come to a right opinion on certain monuments which have been found at intervals on the coast of Syria. In 1873, in a small grotto near the Maabed of Amrit, among the remains of a construction in which M. Renan recognised all that was left of a

[1] One of the most interesting monuments of this class is the stele of Lilybæum. *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. No. 138.

temple, a considerable number of broken statues were found, their heads separated from their bodies. These figures were cut from the white limestone of Amrit.[1] Some of them appear to be figures of gods. The only torso to which a head still adheres has been recognised as one of a Hercules with lion-skin

FIG. 192.—Votive stele from Carthage. From the *Gazette Archéologique.*

head-dress. But this is quite an exception. The iconic character of most of the figures is beyond a doubt.

As these statuettes were found in a grotto within the precincts of a temple, there is every reason to believe that they once

[1] Such details as we possess on the subject of this find are furnished by a letter from M. GAILLARDOT inserted by M. Renan among his *Additions et Corrections* (*Mission*, p. 850).

formed part of the contents of the temple itself. Most likely they represent people of distinction—princes, perhaps, and priests —who, in raising their images close to the sanctuary, wished to

FIG. 193.—Votive stele from Sulcis (Sardinia). Height 28 inches. From Crespi.

perpetuate evidence of their piety. This hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that on the site of the temples of Golgos and Amathus, a great number of statues, often very well preserved, have been found, and that their attitude is only to be explained



FIG. 194.—Votive stele from Sulcis. From Crespi.

in one way. They are both male and female; their heads are bound about sometimes with a veil, sometimes with a crown of flowers; the pendant hair and beard are dressed with



2

3

THREE CYPRIOT HEADS

Louvre

St Elme Gautier del et sc

Printed by Wittmann in Paris France



FIG. 195.—Statue found near Athieno. Limestone. Height 3 feet 11 inches. In the New York Museum.

care, and in their right hands they hold a votive offering—a patera, a dove, a flower, the branch of a tree, or some other object of the same nature (Figs. 195 and 196). Several inscriptions found in Cyprus give us the formula used at the



FIG. 196.—Limestone statue from Cyprus. Height 27½ inches. In the National Library, Paris.

consecration of these figures.[1] It has been suggested that perhaps the statues represent the deities to whom these gifts were offered, rather than the worshipper; but all doubt appears

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. Nos. 11, 88, 89, 92, 93, 94.

to be dispelled by a bilingual dedication, in Phœnician and in Cypriot Greek, in which the Phœnician word meaning statue is rendered not by *ἄγαλμα*, which would be the right one in speaking of a divine image, but by *ἀνδριάς*, which always denotes the figure of a man.[1]

In speaking of another figure found at Amrit M. Renan has already pointed out the connection between the scanty monuments of Phœnician sculpture and the numerous iconic statues which have been found during excavations at Cyprus, and this is how he explains the sentiment which led to the creation of these votive statues: "Must we agree with the hypothesis that would take these figures for a series of portraits of priests and priestesses continued through more than one century? I think not. The personage represented in each figure seems to me to be the author of a vow, the donor of an offering made to the divinity of the temple, the *baal haz-zébakh*, or *master of the sacrifice*, according to the expression used in the tariffs of Marseilles and Carthage. This vow, or sacrifice, was soon over, and its author might fear that it would be soon forgotten. An inscription would do something to keep its memory green, but a statue would be much more certain. In causing himself to be set before the eyes of the god in a material and in an attitude that would recall unceasingly the sacrifice made and homage rendered, the worshipper perpetuated the memory of his piety in the surest way. Such an idea was quite in keeping with the materialistic and almost commercial religion of Phœnicia, where a vow was a sort of business transaction, in which a clearly understood bargain was struck, so to speak, on both sides. We have, then, in these statues, the figures of pious men who came in their order to fulfil their vows, and took every precaution to insure that the liquidation of their debts should be remembered. The size, material, and workmanship of the statues, depended upon the circumstances of those by whom they were set up."[2]

For the safe guarding of these statues, and of the other contents of the temple and its precincts, a numerous *personnel* was required. In a curious inscription recently discovered at Larnaca we find succinct but authentic information as to how this *personnel* was

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. No. 89, and see especially the observations of M. Renan, at page 106, referring to line 2 of the inscription.

[2] RENAN, *Revue Archéologique*, 2nd series, vol. xxxvii. p. 323.



FIG. 197.—Artificial grotto near Gebal. From Renan.

composed.[1] The inscription is written in ink on both sides of a slab; it seems to be a fragment from what we may call the ledger of a Phœnician temple at Kition, which appears to have been dedicated to Astarte. There are some gaps in it, but, as a whole, it gives the expenditure for two months, the sums paid to workmen, to builders and decorators, and the wages or salaries paid to the officers of the temple. The latter are not arranged in the order of their dignity, for the inscription is rather a memorandum than a formal record. The chief officials must have been the sacrificers and those masters of the scribes who are mentioned in other texts; besides them, there were figure porters and men charged with the care of the veils, or curtains, of the sanctuary, barbers who shaved the priests and to whom certain incisions and amputations, which formed part of the rites, were entrusted, parasites, or people who lived at the table of the god, singing women, and women whose persons were the vehicles of worship; for the sacred prostitutions to which we have already alluded were practised here as in all Astarte's temples.

Traces of this rite are to be found in several artificial grottoes in the neighbourhoods of Gebal and Tyre, which are dubbed by M. Renan "prostitution caves."[2] These have in their further wall a niche for the statue of the goddess, and along each side seats and benches cut in the rock. Their purpose is shown by the existence of numerous little triangles cut in the walls, in which archæologists agree to recognize a summary representation of the female *pudenda*, which Herodotus tells us he himself saw cut on the rocks in this very neighbourhood.[3]

In spite of the licentious nature of their rites the Phœnicians were an orderly and far-seeing people. Among the longest and most interesting documents they have left us, we may point out especially those texts engraved upon stone slabs which are known among epigraphists as the *Tariffs of Marseilles and Carthage*.[4]

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. 86, A and B.

[2] *Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 648-652 and 662.

[3] HERODOTUS, ii. 106.

[4] The Marseilles Tariff is No. 165 in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*. That of the Tariff of Carthage is not yet fixed (December, 1883). The latter, however, is nothing but a repetition, with a few slight alterations, of the former. It would appear that an identical tariff was adopted for all the temples of the Phœnician rite, whether they were in the metropolis or in one of the colonies. The Tariff of Marseilles runs to 21 lines; that of Carthage has but 11, and those considerably mutilated.

The ritual and the cost of each of the customary sacrifices are there minutely regulated. Such tables must have been fixed up at the entrance to the temple, where they would at once show the merchant who landed from some weary voyage what it would cost him to keep the vows he had made to Melkart, Astarte, or Tanit, as the case might be. While neglecting nothing that might content the god, he could then take care that he was not cheated by the priest; the Marseilles Tariff specifies, for instance, that the skin of the animal sacrificed was reserved to the worshipper. The fees, on the whole, seem to have been high enough, but it is expressly stipulated that the very poor, who could not afford to provide a living victim, either bird or quadruped, should have nothing to pay.[1] This shows that every facility was given to the poor to bring their gift of bread, or of those figured animals in stone and terra-cotta of which so many were found by Cesnola in the ruins at Golgos.[2]

§ 2.—*The Temple in Cyprus.*

However slight may be his smattering of classic letters, every reader has heard of those temples of Cyprus in which the vague but imposing image of the great Nature goddess of the Syrians was, as it were, gradually condensed into the definite personality of the Greek Aphrodite.[3] The names of the famous shrines of

[1] Line 20.

[2] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 158.

[3] No one has yet succeeded, or seems likely to succeed, in explaining the word Aphrodite by a Greek or Aryan derivation. Its etymology must be sought for in another quarter, and therefore we have the less hesitation in repeating a conjecture recently given out by Herr FRITZ HOMMEL, one of the best Assyriologists of Germany. According to him, *Aphrodite* is no more than a kind of anagram on *Astarte*, through *Ashtoret*, the name given by the Western Shemites to the Chaldæo-Assyrian *Ishtarit*. The Greeks have never had such consonants as *sh* or *j*, so that even now they are quite incapable of pronouncing them, and when they had to adapt their vocal organs to the name of the Syrian goddess they substituted, perhaps unconsciously, the labial φ for the *sh*. It was at the price of this change that the name of the goddess entered their language and she herself their pantheon. *Ashtoret* became *Aphtoret*, then by an easy permutation *Aphrotet*. In much later times, again, they deliberately adopted a new transcription of the Syrian form of the name, and, like their modern descendants when they take words from the Turkish, they replaced the lingual letter by a pure sibillant, so that *Astarte* is one of those derivatives due to educated people which are never so faithful to their prototype as the natural and unconscious modifications set up by the crowd. It is not uncommon to find terms like this, which,

Paphos and Amathos, of Idalion and Golgos, occur again and again in the works of the Greek and Latin poets; it is to them and to other temples founded by the Phœnicians, such as those at Cythera and Eryx, that the goddess of Homer and the lyric poets owes her principal surnames, Κύπρις, Κυπρία, Κυπρογενής, Κυπρογένεια. Her temples were frequented down to the very last days of paganism, and antiquity is better preserved at Cyprus than on the Syrian coast. With the exception of Larnaca—which stands on the site of Kition—neither the chief modern towns in the island, nor its feudal fortresses, were built in the neighbourhood of the old religious centres, and if the excavations had been undertaken in the same spirit as those of M. Renan in Phœnicia, and with equal resources, it is likely that important remains of those buildings would have been found, or, at least, that their plans might have been recovered. Even now, and in spite of the confusion caused by those whose chief aim in exploring was the collection of things for sale to museums, systematic researches directed by a thoroughly trained architect would, perhaps, have good results, and we can only express our surprise that the British Government, now absolute master of the island in which it has forbidden all private enterprise of the kind, should have so long delayed its thorough exploration. At present our knowledge of the religious architecture of Cyprus is very slight. At Kition little has been found; but recent excavations allow us to determine the site of that temple which was, perhaps, the first built by the Syrian merchants on that coast which they were to frequent so long. Until quite recently there rose at Larnaca a mound or hillock known as *Bamboula;* it stood on the confines of the town, on the edge of the marshy basin which was all that remained of the ancient port.[1] In

though originally descended from a single term, have come to have quite different meanings. We have no space to quote certain facts pointed out by Herr Hommel which appear to support his hypothesis; we must be content with referring our readers to his note on this subject in the *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie* (Fleckeisen, 1882, p. 176 No. 30), under the title *Aphrodite-Astarté.* He reserves to himself the right to treat the subject at greater length on some future occasion. We have not here quoted his words, and we have suggested some points for consideration on which he is silent, but we have said nothing which appears to us to militate against his idea. We confess that it seems to us very well founded. It is certain that the Aphrodite of the Greeks came from the East, and it is reasonable enough to suppose that she brought her name with her, as well as her rites and attributes.

[1] See the plan of Larnaca and its neighbourhood given in *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. p. 35.

1880 the English governor caused the hillock to be removed in order to fill up the marshy hollow beside it, and during the operation the substructures of buildings with many antique fragments, and especially terra-cotta figures, strewn about them, were brought to light. Many signs were present to suggest that the mound had once supported a temple of Astarte, a temple to which two marble tablets found in the neighbourhood may have belonged. These tablets were inscribed with tariffs in the Phœnician language.[1] Some Ionic capitals which were sketched by a French architect, M. Saladin, in the course of a voyage in the East, seem to have belonged to this temple. We reproduce below his drawing of the best preserved among them. This fragment belongs, of course, to a date much later than that of the first temple; it dates, in fact, from a time when Greek art had already won a preponderating



FIG. 198.—Capital from Kition, cut from the local stone. Height 18 inches. Drawn by Saladin.

influence at Kition; but yet it preserves a certain originality. There are no oves, and the volute is very deeply hollowed, peculiarities which decided us to reproduce M. Saladin's drawing, although the capital cannot be presented as an example of Phœnician art. It may be looked upon, however, as the last of the series which commences with the far more strange-looking caps reproduced in our Figs. 51, 52, 53. The classic style was near its universal triumph, but at the time when this temple was restored it had still to lay its account with certain local habits and traditions.

The only temple in the island of which we know anything from the old writers is the most famous of all, the temple of Paphos.

[1] See M. RENAN's paper on these inscriptions in the *Revue archéologique*, 2nd series, vol. xli., 1881, p. 29, and the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. p. 92. Cf. HEUZEY, *Catalogue des Figurines*, &c., p. 168 and above, p. 271.

During the Jewish war, Titus, as we are told by Tacitus, "was seized with a desire to visit a sanctuary so frequented by native and foreign pilgrims."[1] And here the historian digresses for a moment to describe in a few words "the origin of the worship, the rites practised in the temple, the form in which the goddess is adored, a form which is to be found nowhere else." What he says on the first of these points is insufficient and obscure, but he gives us a few precise details upon the rules for sacrifices and upon the image of the goddess, "who is not represented in human form, but in that of a circular cone-shaped block of stone. The reason for this shape is unknown."[2] Tacitus adds that "the emperor took pleasure in contemplating the wealth of the temple and the gifts which had accumulated in it under the ancient kings, as well as many antique objects to which the vanity of the Greeks gave an exaggerated age."

But this can have been no Greek temple in which, towards the end of the first century of our era, the eye encountered no better substitute for a statue of the goddess of beauty than a rude block of stone, perhaps a phallic emblem. Those altars of which Tacitus speaks, on which, although sacrifices were offered on them under the open sky, no drop of rain ever fell, were a survival from that form of worship in the open air which was the first practised by the Canaanitish tribes. In the temple at Paphos everything must have borne marked traces of its Syrian origin. The presence of a conical stone in the place of honour in the sanctuary was, if we may use such a metaphor, the dominant note; but the observant visitor would certainly perceive it echoed in the general arrangement of the temple, in the costumes of the priests, and in the rites they imposed on the people.

Elsewhere we find plenty of confirmation of what Tacitus has told us. Upon a whole series of bronze coins struck under the Roman Emperors, from Augustus to Macrinus, in the name of the

[1] TACITUS, *History*, ii. 3.

[2] "Simulacrum deæ non effigie humana; continuus orbis latiore initio tenuem in ambitum, metæ modo, exsurgens, et ratio in obscuro." M. HALÉVY believes that he has unravelled the puzzle that baffled Tacitus. At one of the recent sittings of the *Société asiatique* (October 12th, 1883), he expounded the idea that one of the Semitic names for the divinity, *El*, is to be explained by its other primitive significance, *column*; and the columns which we find in Phœnician temples would be nothing more than summary representations of the mountain, the earliest fetish worshipped by the Syrian populations.

union of Cypriot towns (*κοινὸν Κυπριών*), an edifice appears which archæologists agree in recognizing as the most important temple on the island, that of Paphos (Fig. 199).[1] The representation is very summary, as it always must be in such cases; it was made to remind contemporaries of a building which they all knew, not to help modern archæologists. In order to get the fullest information from such a document as this, the student must begin by mastering the principles upon which the die-sinker proceeds when he has to represent a work of architecture upon the narrow surface of a coin; with a little practice he will learn to read between the lines, and if not to divine all the arrangements of the building, at least to understand those hinted at by the engraver, and to restore much that the latter has been compelled to omit. Here we have the elevation of a façade in front of which extends a semi-circular court inclosed by a balustrade. Beyond the court arises a kind

FIG. 199.—Coin of Cyprus. From Guigniaut.

of pylon with very slender flanking towers. In its upper part there are small windows, and below them an opening or doorway, which the engraver seems to have deliberately enlarged in order to show, in the sanctuary, the rudely fashioned conical stone which did duty for a statue of the goddess; on this a head and pair of arms are roughly indicated. At each side of the quasi-pylon there is a portico, much lower and with a flat roof. Upon this roof and in the front inclosure appear some of the sacred doves of Aphrodite. Between the angle columns of the portico and the pylon, two objects which look like candelabra are indicated (see Figs. 81, 82, 83); they may have served either for incense, or for

[1] We have already figured this same coin on a larger scale (Fig. 58); but the larger woodcut was not taken from the same example. Between the two there are slight differences, due to the unequal skill of the engravers employed; they are not enough to suggest that they followed different models.

burning resin, in the case of night illuminations.[1] Finally in the upper part of the coin, between the summits of the pylon towers, hangs the group of the solar disk and the crescent moon.

This is all that we get from the coin. The engraver, in spite of his narrow space, made a point of introducing the curious emblem in which the originality of the Paphian worship consisted. He did some violence to proportion, and placed it in the middle of his field, and then to increase its importance he enframed it in that monumental façade which must have seemed so striking to visitors approaching the temple. But he is so pre-occupied with this idea that he never thinks of giving any hint as to the plan of the building, and it is when we attempt to form any guess at its arrangement that our difficulties begin. Behind the pylon there may have been a cella divided into naos and pronaos, the former containing the conical stone. Was this the real arrangement, or should we rather believe that the stone was placed, as at Byblos, either in the open air or under a simple pavilion surrounded by a colonnade? We incline towards the latter hypothesis, which seems to agree better with the feeble indications still to be traced on the site.

Two plans have been given of these ruins: one was compiled by Gerhard from the information collected by travellers who visited the site in the early years of the century (Fig. 200);[2] the second by General di Cesnola. Considering that Cesnola bought part of the ground and made wide and deep excavations at several points on the plateau formerly occupied by the temple, the plan he gives, summary as it is, deserves to be preferred to the sketches made by hurried travellers; but we must remember on

[1] In several districts of Greece and Asia Minor houses are still lighted by means of small candelabra fashioned on the same principle as these larger things of the same kind. A metal dish is supported on a pointed wooden stem, the lower end of which is driven into the floor of beaten earth. Chips of resinous wood, or δᾴδι, are burnt in the dish. Many a time, during my travels in the Levant, have I written up the notes of my day's work by the light of such a torch.

[2] *Voyages d'Ali Bey el Abbassi en Afrique et en Asie pendant les Années* 1803-1807 (Paris, 1814, 8vo), vol. ii. pp. 143-145, and plate 34, *a*, *b*, *c*. S. VON HAMMER, *Topographische Ansichten*, 8vo, 1811, vol. ii. pp. 150-152 and corresponding plate. H. HETSCH, in Munter, *Tempel der himmlischen Göttin zu Paphos*, plates i., ii., and p. 30. In the plan we reproduce *a* must be a peristylar court with a basin (*f*), *b* a second court in which the temple proper stood (*c*); in the latter *d* is the pavilion in which this conical stone was placed. The division of the cella into three aisles corresponds well enough with the representation of the temple figured upon the coins.

the other hand that since the beginning of the century many of the stones may have been removed by the inhabitants of the neighbouring village of Kouklia.

Cesnola places in the centre of the plateau a rectangular mass which represents the substructures of the temple properly speaking, the building figured upon the coins. The corner stones are still in place. This parallelogram is inclosed in another, very much larger and with a massive boundary wall, the foundations of which still exist at almost every point on its circumference. These are mostly sunk far beneath the surface, but a few blocks



Fig. 200.—Plan of the remains of the temple at Paphos. From Gerhard.

which still stand above it are of very large size ; one is about eighteen feet long by nine feet wide. The stones of the temple itself, though less than this, are still very large. In this we recognize that Syrian love for huge units of construction which is so evident in the walls of Jerusalem and Arvad, and in the famous temples of Baalbek.

The temple itself was 224 feet long by 165 wide, and the outer inclosure 700 feet by 630 ; these measurements are furnished by Cesnola, but he does not guarantee their minute accuracy.[1] The outer wall was pierced by doorways, and in one the marks of

[1] Cesnola, *Cyprus*, pp. 210—213.

hinges may still be traced. The width of its opening is eighteen feet, enough for the passage of a crowd. The courtyard must have been surrounded by colonnades, under which the faithful could take refuge during the burning noons of summer; even if no vestiges of them were ever to come to light we should have no doubt of their former existence.

It is not so easy to determine the exact character of the inner inclosure or structure. Was it a cella, like that of a Greek temple? neither analogy nor an examination of the existing ruins point to such a thing. We have every reason to believe that, in its general arrangement, the temple at Paphos resembled that at Byblos, which was built by the same architects in honour of the



FIG. 201.—Plan of the remains of the temple at Paphos. According to Cesnola.

same deity; now, in the views of the latter temple which we find upon coins (Fig. 19), the sacred stone is standing in the open air, in the middle of a peristylar court. Why should it not have been the same at Paphos, where the climate was certainly dryer than on the Syrian coast? Two things confirm this idea. One is the mention by Tacitus of those altars which were never moistened by a drop of rain although they stood in the open air. Secondly, the dimensions of the temple accord ill with the notion of a covered building. In order to carry its roof a number of internal supports must have been introduced, and of these some traces would be sure to exist, either bases still *in situ*, or capitals strewn among the ruins. On the other hand, the dimensions

given would do very well for a large courtyard with an idol in the middle and a portico about it.

We should, then, be inclined to guess the temple at Paphos to have been something like this: in the centre the conical stone, surrounded by a balustrade, and perhaps raised on a pedestal; around it a double περιβολή, as the Greeks called it. The smaller and more richly decorated of these inclosed a court into which, so far as we can gather, the faithful were only allowed to penetrate under the guidance of a priest, after having paid certain fees and accomplished certain rites. On the other hand the external court, with its wide doorways, was open to every comer. In both courts, but especially in the inner one, would be ranged those votive monuments whose richness and variety made such an impression on Tacitus. We know that votive statues were not wanting, although they have nearly all been consumed in the limekiln, for both Hammer and Cesnola found numerous pedestals, on some of which inscriptions were still traceable.[1]

On lower ground and nearer the sea, Cesnola found the remains of a smaller rectangular temple, which may, as he suggests, have been raised to mark the spot where the goddess first set foot on the island; in that case it would have been the first station for the pilgrims who came to Cyprus to visit the greater sanctuary. The only remains of the building are two pyramidal monoliths of a brown granite which is nowhere to be found on the island. Their bases are very deeply sunk, and their total height is about nineteen feet. They are each pierced about half way up with a hole of considerable diameter.[2]

In presence of these monoliths, we are struck by a resemblance between them and certain objects on the money struck by the union of Cyprian towns. The building represented on the coins in question is simpler than the one we have described above. It is nothing but a pair of uprights supporting a roof or architrave, beneath which stands the betyle with a dove on its summit. On each side of the doorway, and on the same stylobate, stands a conical stone (Fig. 202). May not the monoliths which now stand on the sea-shore at Paphos have afforded a model for these

[1] HAMMER, *Topographische Ansichten*, pp. 179-183. CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 212.

[2] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 214. See also p. 189, where some more cippi of the same form are mentioned. It is curious that even among the modern peasants there subsist certain superstitious beliefs as to the power of these ancient stones.

latter objects? It is difficult to say; but at least the motive is the same in both cases.

Neither from medals nor ancient authors do we learn anything about the temples at Idalion and Golgos, but as they were smaller than the great building at Paphos, and as they left no ruins standing above the ground to draw the attention of destroyers, they have been preserved to our own day, and when they were disinterred by MM. Lang and Cesnola in 1866-1869, they gave up to science a splendid booty in statues, bronzes, terra-cottas, Greek and Phœnician inscriptions, coins, jewels, &c.[1] Unhappily these excavations were made in such a way that they are of very little use to the historian of architecture.

Mr. Lang discovered a temple at Dali (Idalion) and does not give its plan; he does not even tell us anything as to the condition of the site on which he found such a treasure. As for Cesnola, who seems to have ransacked two separate temples at Golgos, his

FIG. 202.—Coin of Cyprus. From Gerhard.

attention never seems to have been turned to the remains of antique construction. In spite of all probabilities and the formal declaration of an intelligent witness, namely, Mr. Lang, who watched the labourers of his friend and rival at work, he denies the very existence of what seems to have been the older of the two temples.[2] As for the other, we certainly have a sketch of its

[1] In Mr. LANG's book (*Cyprus, its History, its Present Resources and Future Prospects*, 1 vol. 8vo, London, 1878), excavations and archæology occupy but very little space; most of his attention is given to questions of agricultural and political economy. Most of the monuments disentombed by him have gone to enrich the collections in the British Museum. See also an account of Mr. Lang's discoveries in G. PERROT, *L'Ile de Cypre* (*Revue des deux Mondes*, 1st Février, 1879, pp. 579, 580, 584, and 585).

[2] This temple must have been circular according to Mr. Lang. The great statue of Hercules which was found in it suggests that it was consecrated to a god, Melkart, no doubt, who came in the course of ages to be confused with the Greek *Herakles*. See Mr. LANG's letter in the *Revue archéologique*, 2nd series, vol. xxiii. p. 366. Ceccaldi accepts all his conclusions.

plan (Fig. 204), but one made in such a way that it leaves many questions unanswered which might have been set at rest once for all by a few accurate observations taken at the right time.

FIG. 203.—The hill of Paphos, remains of a temple in the foreground. From Cesnola.

From this sketch and from the evidence of G. Colonna Ceccaldi, evidence which would be more valuable than it is, but for the fact



FIG. 204.—Plan of temple at Golgos. From Cesnola.

that at the time of his visit many of the exploring trenches had become filled up, we gather the following data.[1]

[1] On the whole question of this temple see CESNOLA, *Atti della reale Academia delle Scienze di Torino*, vol. vi. 1870, 1871, pp. 534 *et seq.*, and *Cyprus*, ch. v. See too CECCALDI, *Monuments*, pp. 39-51.

Like that of Paphos, this temple was rectangular. It was about sixty-one feet long by thirty wide.[1] Neither here nor at Paphos was the temple oriented as it was in Greece. The two narrow sides of the rectangle faced north and south. We cannot tell through which side the principal door was pierced. Two large doorways, one slightly larger than the other, may, however, be traced in the northern and eastern walls; the upper parts of all the walls have disappeared; it would seem that, as in Assyria, stone was only used for the lower parts. No trace of an outside inclosure has been found. A broken cone found by Ceccaldi, in the middle of the temple, seems to indicate that the goddess was here represented by a symbol like that of Paphos (Figs. 205 and 206). No remains of columns but a few capitals in the stone of the country were encountered. At several points within the site, votive figures carved from the same material were picked up. Some of these represented women suckling children, others cows performing a like office for their calves. One much damaged group is composed of four figures; one of these holds a new-born child, while the mother lies stretched upon a sort of couch, her face still drawn by the agonies of childbirth, and her head upheld by an attendant.[2] The community of subject which links together most of these little sculptures confirms the idea suggested by the presence of the cone, that the goddess of the sanctuary was one of love and generation, that is to say, a form of the Semitic Astarte. She must have been invoked with no less frequency than the deity who gave health and prolonged life. In the same place detached members of human bodies modelled in clay or carved in stone have been found; these, of course, are thank-

[1] We reproduce Cesnola's plan, but without any desire to exaggerate its authority; it differs from the plan given by the same explorer in the account of his explorations at Athieno addressed to the Academy of Turin. If we test the two by the same scale none of the measurements coincide. In the plan presented to the Academy, which is reproduced by DOELL (*Die Sammlung Cesnola* in the *Mémoires de l'Académie de Saint-Pétersbourg*, 7th series, vol. xix. No. 4), there are columns against the door jambs which have disappeared in the map given in his *Cyprus*. A much simpler plan than the latter is given by CECCALDI (*Monuments antiques de Cypre*, p. 41); it shows fewer column bases in the interior, and no shafts or pilasters against the wall. To which of all these documents is our confidence due? We prefer that given in our Fig. 204, because it best corresponds to the double description given by Cesnola and Ceccaldi.

[2] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 158.

offerings for cures wrought by the divinity. Among them occur arms and hands, legs, feet, and the reproductive organs.[1]



FIGS. 205, 206.—Elevation of a cone found at Athieno and section of its lower part.

The sacred cone did not have this inclosure all to itself. There were numerous pedestals, each supporting a statue. Most

[1] *The Cesnola Collection of Cypriote Antiquities, a Descriptive and Pictorial Atlas* (3 vols. folio, James Osgood, Boston, 1884), vol. i. plates xxvii., xviii. and xix. We have borrowed freely from this fine work, in which all the monuments brought from Cyprus by General di Cesnola are reproduced with a care and fidelity which does honour to the American publisher. We can never thank Messrs. Cesnola and Osgood too much for the liberality with which they put their plates at our service, long before they were published. The work comprises 450 plates, a third of which

of these were set against the walls; as many as seventy-two were counted along the eastern side.[1] Other larger pedestals, each supporting two statues placed back to back (Fig. 207), divided the hall lengthwise into five parallel aisles. The pavement consisted of slabs of Cyprian limestone. The statues were found lying on the earth, face downwards for the most part, under a thick covering of rubbish, which appeared to consist chiefly of the washings of crude brick hardened into a kind of cement, out of which it was difficult to disengage the broken sculptures.

Ceccaldi, who studied all that was left of the structure both on the actual site and at the American consulate, gives the following ideal restitution of the Golgos temple: "The temple was built mainly of sun-dried bricks, which formed four walls standing on



FIG. 207.—Pedestal for two statues. Height 15½ inches; length 46 inches.

stone foundations. These walls were lined, like those of the modern Cyprian peasant's house, with a white or coloured waterproof stucco. . . . Wooden pillars with stone capitals upheld a ridge roof, of which the slope was so slight as to form practically a flat terrace, like the roofs still in use in the island. This roof consisted of pieces of timber carefully jointed; over these mats and reeds were spread, and over those, again, a thick layer of beaten earth, which offered a thorough resistance both to

are in colour, while the rest are heliogravures. Each plate will be accompanied by a descriptive notice. The price of the whole is 150 dollars. According to the prospectus, the first volume should contain the objects in marble, stone, and alabaster, all statues colossal and otherwise, statuettes, busts, heads, bas-reliefs, votive offerings, and sarcophagi. In the second will be found objects in bronze, silver, gold, rock-crystal and glass, and precious stones. The third will be reserved for ceramic objects and inscriptions.

[1] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 10.

wet and heat. The outside of the temple of Golgos must, then, have been very simple to look at. In the inside, which was lighted only from the wide doorways, stood a silent population of statues, their cheeks and robes heightened with colour, and in their midst the symbolic cone. Pavilion-shaped lamps of stone cast a dim light into the darker corners, where the long lines of ex-votos hung upon the painted walls." [1]

Purely conjectural as this description must be in many of its details, as a whole it is probable enough; but the chief question after all never seems to have suggested itself to the explorers, and that is whether the building discovered by Cesnola was the temple itself, or only one of its dependencies. Phœnicia, no doubt, like Greece and Egypt, may have had temples built on different models, but it is singular that this temple of Golgos, as it is described to us, should afford so wide a variation from all the types of Semitic temple with which we are acquainted. There is neither a great courtyard surrounded with porticoes, as at Amrit, at Byblos, and Paphos, nor a building in which, as in the temples of Jerusalem and the Nile valley, we may distinguish a sanctuary and a pronaos, a holy place and a holy of holies. Finally, taking the plan given as correct, where, in this nave encumbered with statues, are we to find a place for the divinity of the temple, a place where she would be well in view, as she appears to have been in the sanctuaries of Byblos and Paphos? We are scarcely inclined to see the goddess in the cone we have figured (Fig. 205); the latter is little more than a yard in height, and must have been altogether crushed by the statues, some of them seven feet high, which stood in serried ranks about it. Where, then, are we to look for the real representative of the goddess, and for its place?

There is one way of getting over the difficulty, and that is by supposing that the building in question was not the temple itself, but one of its dependencies, a covered hall raised for the express purpose of receiving the votive offerings and securing to them a greater degree of safety than they could enjoy in the open air. Thus we find on the coin of Byblos, side by side with the great court in which the cone stands, a small closed cella which certainly belongs to the same whole (Fig. 19). The temple itself may well have been so constructed that it has left

[1] *Monuments antiques de Cypre*, pp. 47, 48.

fewer traces than the thick-walled treasure-house in which these votive statues were protected from the weather, but even now, after De Vogüé, Duthoit, and Cesnola, and the peasants of Athieno, have each and all turned over the soil, remains may yet exist which, if rightly questioned, would confirm or confute the hypothesis we have here ventured to put forward.

The temple is generally accompanied by its diminutive, by what we should call a chapel. In a curious little terra-cotta model found at Dali (Fig. 208) we may, perhaps, be allowed to recognize a copy of one of these chapels. It represents a small square building with a doorway ornamented by an isolated, lotus-headed shaft on each side, and a flat shelf, or rudimentary



FIG. 208.—Model of a small temple in terra-cotta. Louvre. Height 8½ inches.

pent-house, above. In the doorway stands a kind of woman-headed bird, and two more women's faces peer from small windows in the sides of the model. The occurrence of the anthropoid bird suggests that the little building is funerary in its character, but there are things about it which also hint that the artist modelled his work on some building with which he was familiar. These are the shafts already mentioned and a number of small circular cavities which can hardly represent anything but holes for pigeons, the sacred bird of Astarte.

We are also inclined to recognize Phœnician chapels in two chambers built of huge, roughly-dressed blocks, which still exist at Larnaca and in the neighbourhood of the prison of Salamis, the

most powerful of the Greek cities in the island. The first-named is known as the *Panaghia Phaneromeni* and is used as an oratory; the latter is called *St. Catherine's Prison.* The first travellers who mention these buildings thought they were tombs,[1] but that idea has been discredited by the results of excavations at the *Panaghia Phaneromeni*;[2] the floor of the little building has been completely cleared, and in our Figs. 209 and 210 we give a plan and perspective of it as it is now. It consists of a vestibule (V) and a covered chamber (H). In the vestible the huge blocks used in the rest of the structure (M) are replaced by smaller stones (T). It is impossible to say whether the building was originally underground,



FIG. 209.—The Panaghia Phaneromeni. Plan.

or whether the earth about it is the result of later accumulations (C). The covered chamber had a door to it, for the grooves into which it fitted are still to be clearly traced. The roof was formed of two huge masses of rock whose lower surfaces were cut into a flat arch. In all this there was nothing to militate against the idea of a tomb, but on clearing the floor of the chamber from the masses of earth and stone with which it was encumbered a circular basin appeared in the middle, in which a spring of water began to rise as soon as the beaten mass which held it down was removed. Now, what could a spring have to do in a tomb? Where is such a

[1] ROSS, *Reise auf den Griechischen Inseln.*, vol. iv. p. 119. CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 49.

[2] MAX OHNEFALSCH RICHTER, *Ein altes Bauwerk bei Larnaca* (*Archæologische Zeitung*, 1881), p. 311 and plate 18.

thing to be found in any known necropolis? It is more natural to suppose that this was a public fountain, perhaps with a religious prestige. From the neighbouring port women and sailors could come to fill their amphoræ, to gossip in the coolness of the heavy roof, and, before they went, to offer up their prayers to the kindly deity, the nymph of the spring, who caused the pellucid water to bubble up just where its freshness would be most welcome. Even now, in spite of all the centuries that have rolled away, the old Phœnician oratory is a place of pilgrimage for the Greek peasants;

FIG. 210.—The Panaghia Phaneromeni. Perspective.

they seek it as an oracle, and the Virgin mother of Christ plays a part in their popular superstitions which would better suit Astarte. "A rough oil lamp and a few matches are placed in the middle of the little apartment. When a lover wishes to know whether his love is returned, he lights the lamp at nightfall; if it be still burning at daybreak, his trouble is at an end; if not, he must console himself as best he can." [1]

In all the temples water was placed within easy reach of the

[1] DE MARICOURT, *Saint-Cyr et Jerusalem*, 8vo, p. 145.

faithful. Like fire, water purifies ; it takes away blemishes. The vessels which held the water required for the ritual ablutions was placed near the temple doors, like the *bénitier* in a Romish church. Close to one entrance to the buildings which he describes as the temple of Golgos, General Cesnola found one of these vessels still in place. It was surrounded by a wreath of ivy, and its diameter was seven feet one inch. But the most curious object of the kind is the vessel known as the *Amathus vase.* This is a great basin of porous limestone, a depressed spheroid in shape, with a small



FIG. 211.—The Amathus vase. Louvre. Height 6 feet 2 inches. Greatest diameter 9 feet 2 inches.

base and a very low neck about a circular mouth (Fig. 211). Four ornamental handles rise at regular intervals near the upper edge of the vessel. All four of these handles are shaped like moulded arches ; they each rise from two palmettes and inclose the figure of a bull turned to the spectator's right. The heads of these bulls have been intentionally mutilated. This monument, which has been in the Louvre ever since 1866, is not the only one of the kind.[1] Another was found close beside it ; this second

[1] M. VOGÜÉ took possession of the Amathus vase in the name of France in 1862. In the same year a ship of war was despatched at the instance of the *Directeur des*

example is higher than the first by sixteen inches, but it is narrower at the base, and its handles are decorated only with a simple moulding. The upper lines of both vessels were originally on the same level; the rock on which they stood was cut so as to make up for the inferior height of the one we have figured. The taller vase was so much broken that it was left where it was found, and its fragments still point out to travellers the site of what was once, no doubt, the chief temple of Amathus.

The weight of the smaller of these two cisterns, that is, the one in Paris, is estimated at 14,000 kilogrammes, or rather less than fifteen tons. They must both have been shaped where they stand out of some block of limestone rising up above the plain. Even under such conditions the task would be no light one, but it is easy to understand why the effort was made. The hill on which the temple stood is destitute of springs, and as far as the eye can reach on every side there is no running water; and yet the purifications of the law had to be accomplished.[1] In the wet season these cisterns were filled with rain-water, but during the rest of the year water had to be carried from the nearest spring or from the city reservoirs, on the backs of horses and donkeys. Large amphoræ, hung on each side of the beast and stopped with a plug of grass or leaves, were used for the purpose, just as they are to-day.

The mouth of these vessels was often placed so high that it could hardly be reached without steps, which might be either detached and movable, or adherent to the basin, and cut out of the same block. The latter arrangement is shown in a small model in the Louvre (Fig. 212), which is, no doubt, a votive offering presented by some faithful worshipper to whom the cost of a larger vessel was prohibitive.[2]

Musées to bring it away. Thanks to the care and skill of an officer named Magen, the difficult operation of its removal was accomplished with perfect success, and the vase, after a visit to Marseilles and Havre, whence it travelled by a flat barge on the Seine, was placed in the Louvre on July 13, 1866. See MAGEN, *Le Vase d'Amathonte, Relation de son Transport en France* in the *Recueil des Travaux de la Société d'Agriculture, Sciences et Arts d'Agen.*

[1] In the ceremonies attending a pilgrimage to Mecca the water of the well Zemzem plays no inconsiderable part. The pilgrims both drink it and wash in it; a number of people gain their living by drawing the water and distributing it among them.

[2] Attention has already been called to this little object by M. HEUZEY (*Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de France*, 1871, pp. 45, 46). The Greeks called such a vessel as this λουτήρ.

There can be little doubt but that some cisterns were of bronze. The famous *brazen sea*, made for Solomon by Phœnician workmen, was neither more nor less than one of these vessels;[1] moreover, in the very cistern on which we have been dwelling it is easy to recognize the imitation of a bronze original. The



FIG. 212.—Small model of a cistern, 3¾ inches high. Louvre.

handles especially are characteristic (Fig. 213). As they were only for ornament they are not pierced so as to allow the passage of the hand, but in their details it is not difficult to trace what may be called the true spirit of metal design. Look for instance at the two palmettes and the quasi-volutes which



FIG. 213.—Handle of the Amathus vase.

unite them to the ends of the handles; they embody one of the favourite motives of the worker in metal. Bronze handles from vessels that have disappeared are common in all the great museums of Europe, and if we cast our eyes over any of the series thus formed we shall find more than one example of this

[1] 1 KINGS, vii. 25; 2 CHRONICLES, iv. 4.

very palmette. In this instance the imitation is so faithful that upon the stone (between the palmette proper and the volute) we may distinguish the rounded head of the rivet which, in the bronze, was used to attach the handle to the body of the vessel.[1]

The appearance of the bull in the hollow of the handle is natural enough. Both in Egypt and Assyria he was a favourite object for the beauty of his form and for the ideas he symbolized. At Jerusalem the *brazen sea* was supported on the backs of twelve bulls.

It is in its proportions and in the motives of its decoration that the oriental character of the Amathus vase resides, for it does not date apparently from any very remote antiquity. By their execution, the bulls in the handles offer a marked analogy with the animal engraved on the fine Cypriot coins attributed by the Duc de Luynes to Salamis, and to about the year 500 B.C.;[2] we reproduce one here so that our readers may judge of the resemblance for themselves (Fig. 214).

FIG. 214.—Coin of Cyprus.

Among the contents of those Cypriot temples whose treasures excited the admiration of Roman travellers, thrones were certainly included; chairs of stone or of bronze incrusted with gold and silver. One of the former was found by Cesnola on the site of the temple of Golgos;[3] he gives no drawing of it, but he figures two steps of the same material which were found close to the chair. Both are ornamented on their anterior faces with bas-reliefs

[1] DE LONGPÉRIER had already called attention to this; we have made considerable use of his paper on the Amathus vase and have borrowed his drawing (*Musée Napoléon III.*), pl. xxxiii.

[2] DE LUYNES, *Numismatique et Inscriptions cypriotes*, 1852, p. 19, and plate iii. 1-12.

[3] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 159. The remains of a bronze throne were found by Cesnola in one of those chambers in which the treasure of the temple of Curium was stored (*Cyprus*, p. 355). Lions' heads and paws and bulls' heads formed part of its ornament; their arrangement may be easily divined from the analogy of Assyrian pieces of furniture of the same kind (*Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, Figs. 193, 199, 200, 203).

enframed between two large rosettes; the smaller of the two shows a lion bringing down a stag; the larger, the fabulous *Chimæra*, whose home was placed by the Greeks in Lycia, the country that faced the northern shore of Cyprus[1] (Fig. 215). Here too both animals and rosettes are of oriental aspect.

The wealth accumulated in the Cyprian temples is proved not only by the words of Tacitus and the variety of objects discovered at various points in the island, but also by the famous *Treasure of Curium*, which was found intact by General Louis Palma di Cesnola, a discovery which is enough by itself to render his name illustrious. Never, perhaps, has explorer been more fortunate or more skilful in making the best use of his good fortune. We have given an account of the explorations elsewhere, and we must wait till we come to speak of Phœnician jewelry and work in the precious metals before we describe many of the objects in detail; at



FIG. 215.—Stone step. From Cesnola.

present we have only to draw attention to a curious architectural arrangement which should be studied by all future explorers in the island.

One of the temples at Curium had a true crypt (Fig. 216), which was reached by a staircase leading to a low and narrow corridor (A A); the latter gave access to four semi-circular chambers (C, D, E, F) hollowed in the limestone rock and communicating with one another by doorways (B B). Beyond the last of these chambers there was another narrow corridor, but the air in it was so bad that the excavators had to retire without exploring it to the end.

The first three chambers were all the same size; 13 feet 8 inches high, by 23 feet 3 inches long, and 21 feet 4 inches wide. The fourth (F) was a little smaller. The booty found in these

[1] See HOMER, *Iliad*, vi. 181.

four rooms surpassed all hope. Never had so many jewels, in which the materials were so rich and the styles so varied, been before encountered. There were bracelets of massive gold, two of them weighing each but little short of a pound; several others weighed from ten to twelve ounces. Gold was found, indeed, in profusion and in all kinds of forms: rings, ear-rings, amulets, little boxes and bottles, hair-pins, necklaces; silver was still more abundant in jewelry and in dishes; neither was electrum, the alloy of gold and silver, absent; objects of rock crystal, of carnation, of onyx, of agate, of every variety of hard and precious stone, and of glass, were found, as well as soft stone cylinders, statuettes of terra-cotta, earthenware vases and bronze lamps, candelabra,



FIG. 216.—Plan of the crypt at Curium. From Cesnola.

chairs, vases, weapons, &c. A certain order was perceptible in the way this treasure was stored. The jewels of gold were found chiefly in the first chamber; in the second the silver dishes were ranged on a shelf cut in the rock about eight inches above the floor. Unhappily these were much more seriously injured by oxidization than the gold, and from the mass of metal that fell into dust as soon as touched, only a small number of those bowls or cups, which have lately roused so much curiosity among archæologists, were saved. The third room contained a few bronze lamps and fibulæ, some alabaster vases, and a great number of earthenware vessels and statuettes. In the fourth there were bronze utensils, with several of copper and iron among them, and,

in the partly explored passage at the end seven bronze kettles or cauldrons.

Even more precious, however, than the materials employed is the great variety of methods in which they are used, showing that all these objects are by no means identical in their local origin.[1] Some scarabs in steatite seem to be of Egyptian *provenance;* upon one of them we may recognize the oval of Thothmes III. A certain number of cylinders are certainly Assyrian and Chaldæan. Several, by their symbols and cuneiform inscriptions, appear to belong to the epoch of the Sargonids, that is, to the seventh century before our era. Others, to which by their execution, symbolism, and mounting, a Phœnician origin may be certainly ascribed, are very numerous. Many of the intaglios may fairly be placed among the oldest and most curious productions of the glyptic artists of Greece. The jewels proper often show much invention, combined with an astonishing *finesse* and delicacy of execution; some of them are so graceful that they deserve a place among the masterpieces of the oriental goldsmiths, and of those of Greece in her archaic period.

We shall have an opportunity hereafter of studying these things more carefully. Our present object is to give an idea of the number, value, and variety of the treasures contained in this curious depot. They were not placed there to amuse amateurs or to edify archæologists, but none the less do they constitute a veritable museum, in which artists may compare the styles of various schools, may admire fine workmanship and grasp the secret of the processes by which it is turned out. Until these chambers were explored we only knew the temple treasures from those documents engraved upon marble, in which an inventory of the votive objects contained in some of chief Grecian sanctuaries, at Athens for example, and Delos, is drawn up. Succinct as they are, these lists enabled us to realise how greatly those sacred collections must have favoured the development of art and taste; how much more, then, should we be able to learn from the objects themselves, now that they can be closely examined, weighed, and described!

The value of the temple collections as schools of art can

[1] See, in the appendices to *Cyprus*, the description given by C. W. KING, of Trinity College, Cambridge, of the intaglios upon metal and stone contained in this treasure (*The Rings and Gems in the Treasure at Curium*).

nowhere have been greater than in Cyprus; nowhere can these exhibitions, as we may fairly call them, have offered a greater variety than in the shrines of an island which the Greeks began to frequent at a very early period, shrines which were thus loaded for centuries with the gifts of two different races. Egypt, Chaldæa, and Assyria had no secrets from the Phœnicians; in their countless voyages, the latter must have become acquainted with everything those countries produced which could by any means be turned to the honour of their own gods, and a little later, when the originality of the Greek genius began to assert itself, visitors from Greece came in their turn to offer the best works of their native artisans to those gods whom they were seeking to appropriate to their own use. If the treasure of the great Paphian sanctuary had, by some happy chance, been preserved to us, what a variety of styles, what a number of curious and even marvellous works of art we should have found! It would have sufficed to arrange the objects in some kind of order, to have before us a history of ancient art, as told by the monuments themselves, which would have enabled us to follow the happy borrowings and fertile contacts which so greatly helped the task of the Greeks, and saved them so much priceless time.

This good fortune has been denied us. The temple whose treasure was recovered by General di Cesnola was less celebrated and therefore less rich than that of Paphos. Perhaps it was not even the principal temple of Curium. That city could boast of a sanctuary of Apollo which, according to what Strabo says of it, must have enjoyed a certain importance;[1] but according to the evidence gathered by General di Cesnola, it is not unlikely that its site was at a different point in the area occupied by the city, and far enough from the ruins the subtructures of which had such a delightful surprise in store.[2] In that case we do not even know the character and name of the god to whom Cesnola's temple was consecrated. We are told that Curium was a Greek city, an Argive colony;[3] it is certain that the Greek element won the upper hand there in time; but tradition said that its founder was a son of Cineras,[4] and to Greek annalists Cineras was a personification of the Phœnician race. It would seem possible, therefore,

[1] STRABO, xiv. vi. 3. [2] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, pp. 342, 343.
[3] STRABO, xiv. vi. 3 HERODOTUS, v. 113.
[4] STEPHANUS BYZANTINUS, s. v. Κούριον.

that a Phœnician settlement preceded the Argive colony at Curium, and that long after the Greeks had taken possession of the place it had a numerous Semitic population. This conjecture is to a certain extent confirmed by the fact that in the fifth century, when the chief Grecian cities in the island rebelled against Darius, Stesenor, king of Curium, betrayed the national cause and fraternized with the Phœnician kings of the south-west and the Persian army.[1] However this may be, we find that at Curium, although a few objects, such as a fine terra-cotta vase and some jewels and engraved stones, are Greek in their origin, the great mass of the treasure is of oriental, *i.e.* of Cypriot and Phœnician, manufacture. The intaglios in metal and *pietra-dura* form one of the richest and most interesting sections of the collection, and by far the larger number of them are of Assyrian, Egyptian, or Phœnician workmanship. From this we may fairly conclude that the influence of Greek taste had scarcely begun to make itself felt in the island, even in many of the Greek colonies, when the vault was closed.

Why and when did the closure take place? This is a difficult question to answer, but it is one which the archæologist cannot pass over in silence.

We agree with General di Cesnola that the treasure cannot as a rule have been kept in the four chambers in which it was found.[2] These are paved with round blueish pebbles set in a bed of cement, beneath which there is a layer of sand. This method of making a floor is still in use in the better houses in the island. But in spite of it the room at Curium must always have been very damp; most of the vases and other utensils of copper or silver have been reduced to dust. And when a faithful worshipper offered either his own image or some object of value to his deity, it was not that it might be put away in a subterranean cellar, where no one would see it and where it might be forgotten by the god himself. Even in those days men liked their piety and generosity to bring them immediate honour. When Eteandros, king of Paphos, consecrated two heavy golden bracelets (Fig. 217), in the temple of Curium, and engraved his name and title upon them in Cypriot characters,[3] his intention was that his name

[1] Herodotus, v. 113.

[2] Cesnola, *Cyprus*, p. 305.

[3] The inscription is hardly perceptible in our woodcut because it is traced in the interior of the circle, where the shadow comes.

should be read by those who visited the sanctuary, and that his offering should be placed before the eyes of the god to whom it was presented. We can hardly doubt, therefore, that these four chambers with their connecting passage formed a crypt or hiding place in which the more valuable property of the temple could be concealed on any sudden alarm.[1] They were cut in the living rock and covered by the flooring of the temple. The only access was by a low and narrow passage, which could easily be filled up with earth ; the whole arrangement was well contrived to protect the treasures of the god against a sudden surprise, against the impatient violence of soldiers flushed with victory.

We know too little of the internal history of Cyprus to be able to say at what moment and by fear of what danger the priests of

FIG. 217.—Gold bracelet. Weight 449 grammes. From Cesnola.

the temple were driven to bury their valuables. The struggle with Persia in 500 suggests itself. Curium entered into the coalition of cities associated with the revolt of Ionia, and when she heard that Darius had passed considerable forces into the island with the help of the Phœnician fleet, she may well have taken the alarm and placed her treasures beyond the reach of profanation. She did not yet suspect that her king, Stesenor, would buy his own pardon and that of his subjects by treason on the field of battle. The first difficulty this explanation meets with

[1] In Greece the temple of Delphi had underground cellars which were used for the same purpose. Strabo tells us that, during the sacred war, Onomarchus sent men down there to bring away the treasures hidden in the crypts ; but the earth quaked and the terrified workmen abandoned their task before they had well begun it (ix. iii. 8).

lies in the fact that the treasure was not restored to its place in the temple. That so many priceless objects should have been left neglected is only to be explained, so far as we can see, by supposing that the town was taken and sacked, and that all those officers of the temple who knew of the secret hiding-place and its contents were slain. But from what Herodotus tells us as to the part played by Curium in that campaign, we cannot believe that such a disaster should have overtaken a city whose prince had just rendered so great a service to the Persian satrap. Again, among the intaglios found in these subterranean chambers there are some which I am inclined to ascribe to the fifth rather than to the sixth century B.C.; they show hardly a trace of archaism; the nude is treated with much ease and freedom; the female nude especially is presented in attitudes which imply much familiarity with the subject.[1] As we have begun to guess, why should we not go on? May we not suppose that the treason of Stesenor excited the fury of the Greeks in the island, and especially at Salamis, and that when, towards the middle of the fifth century, Cimon appeared with his victorious fleet in Cyprian waters, Curium was besieged and sacked by its neighbours? The collection includes one or two intaglios of such an advanced style of execution that we might at a pinch bring down the closing of the vaults to the time of Evagoras. At that period, again, the island was torn by sanguinary conflicts between the partisans of Persia and those who stood out for national independence, and between the two Curium may have paid dearly for the fault of a century before.

In any case it appears that a certain tradition of the buried treasure survived, for the mosaic pavement of the temple had been pierced at several points, and Cesnola was able to trace excavations to a depth of from six to seven feet which, being ill directed, came to an end against the rocky foundations. His suspicions were, in fact, aroused by these abortive pits.[2] The floor in their neighbourhood sounded hollow, and by turning the

[1] Mr. KING, in his attempt at a catalogue of the intaglios in the treasure of Curium, thinks that the series which he endeavours to establish embraces a period extending from the very beginnings of the glyptic art to the commencement of the fifth century before our era (CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 354). He calls particular attention to the following intaglios figured in Cesnola's work: Plate xxxix. 5, 6, 7, 8; and plate xl. 12 and 13.

[2] CESNOLA, *Cyprus*, p. 302

obstacle which had stopped his predecessors and digging much deeper, he arrived at the hiding-place which they had missed. Evidently the first explorer had not belonged to the *personnel* of the temple. He was not one of the priests or servants who, at the first alarm, had carried every precious object into the crypt and arranged them there in an order which proves that the operation was not hastily carried out, but completed at leisure by men who thought the necessity for concealment would soon be over. But their hopes were vain, and it is probable that every man about the temple perished in the massacre, carrying with him the secret of these vaulted chambers. We dare not pretend to regret their death, but let us at least join the archæologist who has described the intaglios from Curium with such loving care,[1] in rendering our tribute to the memory of those faithful guardians who took such efficient means to preserve the wealth of their god from sacrilege.

§ 3.—*The Temples of Gozo and Malta.*

We have already had occasion to quote the Phœnician monuments found at Malta (Figs. 28 and 46). That island and its neighbouring islet of Gaulos, now Gozo, were the first points to be occupied by the Tyrians and Sidonians when they began to frequent the central basin of the Mediterranean. We do not know whether they were the first inhabitants or not, but it is certain that the peculiarities of the situation caused them to colonise the islands in force. When Carthage took up the heritage of Tyre in the western Mediterranean, Malta became one of her naval stations, and even when the fortune of war brought Malta and Gozo under the Roman standard, the Phœnician language continued to be written and spoken in them, as we know from the inscriptions on some of the coins and still more from the types which most of them bear (see Fig. 218). The Italian merchants and magistrates must have introduced Latin, but perhaps it had not entirely superseded the Semitic idiom even when, at the end of the ninth century of our era, the

[1] KING, in Cesnola's *Cyprus*, p. 387.

island fell for two hundred years into the hands of the Arabs.[1] The latter would therefore have no difficulty in ingrafting their own tongue upon that of the islanders, and to this day Arabic forms the basis of the very peculiar dialect spoken by the inhabitants of the little archipelago. Twice, therefore, in its history Malta has been an advanced port for Oriental or African powers, once when the Phœnicians attempted to bring all the coasts of Italy and Sicily within their grasp, and again in the middle ages, when it had mosques and minarets from whose summits the muezzin proclaimed the still widening faith of Mahomet.

The existence far into the full flush of Græco-Roman civilization of temples in which everything, idols, rites, and architecture, was Semitic and Oriental, is proved by inscriptions. One of the most curious Phœnician texts extant mentions the

FIG. 218.—Coin of Malta. Bronze. From Duruy.[2]

construction of three or four sanctuaries by the people of Gozo.[3] One was raised to the glory of Sadambaal, a second in honour of Astarte; chips in the marble have removed the name of a third divinity, perhaps of a fourth. But whatever the number may have been, the names of Sadambaal and Astarte are enough

[1] In the *Acts of the Apostles* (xxviii. 2) the inhabitants of Malta, on to which St. Paul was carried by the tempest, are called *barbarians* by the sacred writer; we may infer from that that Paul and his companions were surprised to find in the peasants and fishermen by whom they were saved and warmed at a great fire people who spoke neither Greek nor Latin. As for their Semitic dialect, it was, no doubt, so much altered that a Jew could not understand it.

[2] The inscription MEΛITAIΩN is Greek, but the types are both quite Oriental in character. On one side we find Isis, with an Egyptian head-dress, and one of those symbols which are continually met with on the votive steles of Tanit from Carthage. On the reverse we find one of those winged deities, with the points of their wings urned up, which also occur so often on Carthaginian steles (Fig. 187) and Phœnician coins (GERHARD, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, plate 43).

[3] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. No. 132.

to show that no gods of the Greek pantheon are in question. The text, without being very old, is apparently no later than the end of the third Punic war. Taking a mean between the extreme dates proposed, we may place the works it was meant to record at about the middle of the third century before our era.

By a curious coincidence the ruins of two buildings obviously religious in their character have been discovered on this very soil of Gozo. Such a small island can hardly have been blessed with many temples, so that we may fairly guess that in these remains we see all that is left of two of the temples referred to in the inscription. Not that the point is of any great importance ; long before this inscription was discovered and translated the buildings in question were recognised as temples. The only mistake made by the explorers who first drew attention to them was in taking *au sérieux* the name given to them by the peasants, the *Giganteia*, or "giant's building."[1] This name led them to credit the ruins with a prodigious antiquity, and even to half accept them as the work of a race of giants who inhabited the island before the arrival of the Phœnician colonists, perhaps before the flood !

Such dreams are to be explained and excused by the want of all points of comparison. The ancient monuments of Syria were as yet hardly known, and explorers came to their conclusions without knowing how fond the Phœnicians were of materials of extravagant size, and how they inoculated all the peoples with whom they came in contact with that taste. In the Giganteia, as in some of the ruins in Malta itself, there are stones from ten to twenty feet long, and of proportional height and width (Fig. 219).[2] Such dimensions might well astonish the agriculturists of Gozo, who were accustomed to build with mere chips of stone ; but they will seem modest enough to those who have stood before the walls of

[1] During the last eighty years these ruins have been often drawn and studied. A list of these successive explorations is given in CARUANA (*Report on the Phœnician and Roman Antiquities in the Group of the Islands of Malta*, 8vo, Malta, 1882). This report, which was drawn up under the orders of the English governor by the keeper of the public library, gives a sufficiently accurate statement of the present condition of these monuments. We gather from it that the so-called *Giganteia* has suffered much during the last fifty years. Many curious parts of the structure are no longer in existence which were there in 1834, when Albert de la Marmora made the drawings which we reproduce. For the history of the monument and its present state see the *Report*, pp. 7-9.

[2] Our figs. 219 and 220 have been engraved from a photograph sent to us by M. Dugit, Dean of the *Faculté des Lettres* of Grenoble.

Arvad, of the Haram-ech-Cherif, at Jerusalem, or before the famous trilithon of Baalbek. Another mania that possessed these same workmen was for applying to dressed stone the processes with which they attacked the living rock. From a single stone they would cut an entire column or even doorway, things which elsewhere would be made up of various different members;[1] now, we could hardly name a more remarkable instance of this tendency than the doorway leading into a hall in one of the temples of Malta. It has neither jamb nor lintel. It has been cut with the chisel through a huge slab of limestone kept in place by a pair of tall uprights (Fig. 220).

If we examine the general arrangements of these temples at Gozo and Malta, we find in them none of the features which distinguish the religious buildings raised by the Greeks and Romans; the whole spirit of their construction is Phœnician. Of this our readers may judge from the plans, sections, and details we are about to give of the two best preserved of these monuments: the *Giganteia* of Gozo and the *Hagiar Kim*, or "stones of adoration," which are to be found at Malta, near the village of *Casal Crendi*.

The *Giganteia* comprises two temples close together, but without any direct communication from one to the other. Their doorways face westwards and open through a long wall which binds them to each other, forming a façade for both (Fig. 221); the axes of the two buildings are parallel and their plans are almost identical, but their dimensions are by no means the same. The more northern building is much the larger; we may guess that it was dedicated to the more powerful of the two deities here worshipped.

Each temple consists of two halls communicating by a narrow passage; their shape is an elongated ellipse. In line with the outer door and with the passage between the two halls the building ends in each case in a small apse, or hemicycle, the floor of which is raised slightly above that of the chamber from which it opens. In each of the lateral apses there is a similar daïs, giving to the whole a certain resemblance to the choir and side chapels of a modern Roman Catholic church (Fig. 222). It is probable that a barrier formerly separated these raised platforms from the public part of the hall. The right apse in the first hall was reached by a flight of semicircular steps, projecting out into the body of the chamber.

[1] See above, p. 109.



FIG. 219.—Hall in the temple of Hagiar Kim, at Malta.

It was here that the most unmistakable traces of the ancient worship, a worship in which the divinity was represented by the same emblem as at Byblos and Paphos, were found. The cone (Fig. 223) had been overturned but its site was easy to recognize. This was a sort of pavilion at each side of which stood a stone upright, like those figured on the Phœnician and Cyprian coins to which we have already alluded. Two heads, roughly carved



FIG. 220.—Doorway in the temple of Hagiar Kim, at Malta.

in the local stone, were found lying upon the ground in the larger temple not far from the cone. Their cheeks were enframed in a long veil, and they resembled to some extent the heads on the Egyptian Canopic vases.[1]

The whole building is 440 feet in circumference and eighty-eight feet in greatest length, internal measurement. Its greatest width is seventy-six feet eight inches, and its width across the outer hall

[1] LA MARMORA, p. 13, and plate i. figs. *p.* and *p*[1].

fifty-three feet eight inches. There is no sign of any kind of roof. The sacred emblem alone seems to have been protected against the weather; and the rest of the building was open to the sky. In the right hand apse of the second chamber there is a basin cut in the rock which forms the floor; it was used, no doubt, for ablutions. Some quadrangular blocks which stand up through the soil in the same chamber must have been altars. In front of the apse in the first hall the stones are covered with an elaborate decoration of spirals and of bosses in the shape of women's breasts



Fig. 221.—Plan of the Giganteia at Gozo. From La Marmora.

with a hole in the centre.[1] On one block a snake or an eel-shaped fish is chiselled.[2] We shall again encounter this same barbaric decoration at *Hagiar Kim*.

The second temple, situated to the south of the one just described, is less interesting; the floors of the apses lie at the same level as that of the central passage. There are neither altars nor elaborately carved stones. Either the building was

[1] La Marmora, plate i. figs. *m*. and *n*.

[2] *Ibid.* plate i. fig. *g*.



FIG. 222.—Longitudinal section through the larger temple at the Giganteia, along line G F (Fig. 221). From La Marmora.

intended to be less elaborate than the first or it was never finished (Fig. 224).

The method of construction at the *Giganteia* is identical with that at *Hagiar Kim;* we find the same irregularity and the same use of huge blocks in both. One block, marked C on the plan

FIG. 223.—The cone of the Giganteia. Height about 40 inches. From La Marmora.

(Fig. 225), and the largest in the building, is twenty-two feet six inches long, ten feet eleven inches high, and three feet seven inches wide. One great pier is twenty feet three inches high.[1] The plan is more complicated than that of the temples at Gozo, but the



FIG. 224.—The Giganteia, longitudinal section of the second temple through the line D M. From La Marmora.

same fondness for ellipsoids is to be traced in the shapes both of the building as a whole and of the separate chambers. There

[1] We borrow these particulars from the first description ever given of these ruins; it was published after the excavation of 1840 under the title: *Description of an Ancient Temple near Crendi, Malta, in a Letter from J. G. Vance to M. Carlisle*, in the *Archæologia*, vol. xxix. pp. 227-240. This description is accompanied by six wretched plates. Not long afterwards attention was called to the same ruins by M. CH. LENORMANT, who spoke of them in a letter addressed to *M. César Daly* at the beginning of one of his voyages to the East (*Monuments phéniciens de Malte*, in the *Revue générale de l'Architecture et des Travaux publics*, 1841, p. 497 and plate 21). Our plan and the details of *Hagiar Kim* which we here reproduce are taken from the plates in M. Caruana's *Report* and from the photographs given with it.

seem to have been two entrances, and seven apses may still be traced; symmetry suggests an eighth which we have ventured to indicate by dotted lines. In the two principal chambers (A and B) the semicircular parts seem to have been divided from the rest. Our plan shows a line of masonry, a single course, which may either have been used to retain an elevated daïs or to support a screen; in any case, it forms a line of demarcation between what we should call the nave and the choir. If these two saloons had



FIG. 225.—Plan of the temple of Hagiar Kim, Malta. From Caruana.

no companions the plan would not sensibly differ from that of the *Gigantcia;* the only difference would lie in the omission of the corridor, which, in the Gozo temples, leads from one room to the other. We may be allowed to guess that the four chambers to the left of A and B are later additions. They may have afforded accommodation for the worship of secondary deities, and to their construction may be due the disappearance of the second apse of hall B. Two of these new chambers (E and D) have recesses in their side walls, which appear to have been what we should call

chapels; they were each covered with a single flat stone, the only trace of a roof to be found in the whole building.

The chief sanctuary seems to have been in the first of the two great halls. An effort at decoration seems here to have been made, and several curious fragments have been found among the *débris*. The whole of the walls are covered with an ornament made up of a multitude of small holes, in which some people have chosen to see an imitation of the star-sprinkled vault of heaven (Fig. 226).[1] Such an explanation is, perhaps, more ingenious than well founded; is it not more simple to suppose that the general effect was agreeable to those early architects? A similar decoration

FIG. 226.—Interior of the temple of Hagiar Kim. From Caruana.

has been observed in certain parts of the temple at Gozo.[2] These myriads of stabs are no more, in our opinion, than a decoration suggested by the same ideas and carried out on the same principle as the carefully chiselled joints of which, as we have already seen, other workmen of the same race were so fond.

This same decoration occurs on two fragments picked up in the principal hall at *Hagiar Kim* (A), and now preserved in the public library of Malta. One of the two is a slab with a decoration resembling that of one of the stones of the *Giganteia*. Below a

[1] CARUANA, *Report*, pp. 10, 11.
[2] LA MARMORA, plate i. fig. *h*.

slightly salient band or fillet hangs a conical or egg-shaped excrescence flanked on either side by a pendant spiral like the hook of a pastoral staff (Fig. 227). In this, too, a symbol has been discovered, and some have pretended to see in it a figurative representation of the world springing from an egg.[1] If that were his meaning we can hardly congratulate the stone-cutter on the clarity with which he has expressed his thoughts. Why was he satisfied with half an egg, and why did he hide that half between those two eye-filling volutes? To us it seems to be nothing more than an ornamental motive; a roughly-suggested egg between two of those huge spirals which play such a conspicuous part in all primitive systems of decoration; we shall meet it in force in the art of Mycenæ.



FIG. 227.—Decorated stone, from Hagiar Kim. From Caruana.

The second monument found in this hall is an altar of very singular shape (Fig. 228). The most curious thing about it is the vertical concavity which takes up so much of its anterior face. In this hollow a not unskilful chisel has carved a sort of shrub with leaves symmetrically arranged, which seems to spring from a box. The Maltese decorator, probably a village mason, has copied some familiar plant, just as the ceramists of Thera, Ialysos and Mycenæ were wont to do; and yet the mystic speculations of a Philo and a Damascius have been ransacked to discover some profound meaning in his work, and to turn his humble but effective ornament into a sacred tree.

In the same enclosure, and not far from the altar we have described, several more of much simpler form were discovered. Of one we catch a glimpse in Fig. 226; it is mushroom-shaped,

[1] CARUANA *Report*, pp. 10, 11.

and deserves to figure on a larger scale (Fig. 229) on account of its resemblance to a type of altar often met with in Syria (Fig. 191).

Here as at Gozo the fragments of a cone have been found ; its base instead of being elliptic, as at the Giganteia, is circular.[1] In this same room (A) seven small figures carved in the local limestone were picked up ; they are now in the Library of Valetta. In the absence of anything that may be called an attribute it is difficult to decide whether these are votive statuettes or idols, or, as the Maltese scholars think, the seven Cabeiri.[2] Their heads have disappeared ; they were probably metal additions for there are no



FIG. 228.—Altar. Hagiar Kim, Height 28½ inches. Diameter of its table 14½ inches. From Caruana.

marks of breakage. At the neck there is simply a hollow, and, in two of the figures, a pair of small sockets. The workmanship is so rough that it is difficult to determine the sex. Most of the statuettes are nude (Fig. 230), but two seem to be dressed in long robes (Fig. 231) ; some are seated, others crouched on their heels. At the back of one a long tress of hair falls to the feet. At first sight the fullness of the chest seems to hint at the feminine gender, but there is no certain indication. All the figures are fat to deformity. The sculptor, if we may give him such a title, has wished thus to suggest that his gods or his men, as the case may be, were beings

[1] LA MARMORA, plate ii. figs. 9, 10.

[2] CARUANA, *Report*, p. 30.

of great power. The execution is incredibly rough. The hands and feet are not modelled at all. The limbs end in shapeless stumps.



FIG. 229.—Altar. Hagiar Kim. Malta. Height 38 inches. From Caruana.

Hagiar Kim is not the only temple whose ruins still exist in Malta; the remains of a building, not unlike the Giganteia in its arrangements, are to be encountered not much more than half a mile off, at a place called Mnaidra.[1] It includes two pairs of oval



FIG. 230.—Statuette. Height 7 inches. From Caruana.

chambers, in which stand more than one of those mushroom-shaped altars which have been found at *Hagiar Kim*. Some remains of a still larger building exist at *Bordj-en-Nadur*, near the harbour of Marsa Scirocco;[2] it was long used as an open quarry by the knights

[1] CARUANA, *Report*, pp. 14-17. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 17-19.

of St. John, and now hardly anything is left of it beyond the wall of which we have already given a wood-cut (Fig. 46). This wall surrounds an apse whose dimensions suggest larger rooms than those of the other temples. A marble pavement and some shafts of columns have been rescued at different times from the *débris*. The two marble cippi with inscriptions to Melkart came from these ruins (Fig. 28),[1] whence it has been reasonably concluded that the temple was dedicated to that god, and was, perhaps, the chief religious building in the island. Finally, there are some more ruins of the same character on the slope of the Corradino hill, close to the great harbour. In 1840 excavations, too soon abandoned, laid bare the entrance and two apses.[2]

FIG. 231.—Statuette. Height 8¾ inches. From Caruana.

Our readers may be surprised at our insistance on monuments in which the art is so poor, but we had our reasons for treating them at length. They are little known ; several of them are really well preserved, at least in parts, while they furnish us with authentic if not elegant types of that religious architecture of the Phœnicians of which we know so little. When we compare the temples of Gozo and Malta with those of Cyprus and Phœnicia proper we only find one feature peculiar to the former, and that is the love of the Maltese architect for the elongated ellipse and its consequence, an apse-shaped sanctuary.[3] With that exception we find

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. Nos. 122 and 122 *bis*.

[2] CARUANA, *Report*, pp. 19, 20.

[3] Some of the temples of the great Syrian goddess were also of this shape. A painting at Pompeii represents a semicircular pavilion with a great cone in the centre (ROUX, *Herculaneum et Pompéi*, 5th series, vol. iii. pp. 16-22, and plate vii.)

all the features encountered in the Levant, the same irregular masonry, the same huge units, the same liking for worship in the open air, the same altars and isolated piers, finally, the same emblem in the place of honour, the sacred cone. The similarities are striking and the differences are much the same as those we should find between a village church and a great cathedral. In spite of its advantageous situation Malta was too small to become, especially in antiquity, an important centre of population. In the fine season, when merchant fleets and ships of war lay in the ports of the archipelago, all was life and animation; captains and seamen escaped from the perils of the deep, carried their offerings to Melkart, Esmoun, and Astarte, and some of these offerings, like the cippi on which the names of Abdosir and Osirsamar appear, were of considerable value;[1] but their number and richness did not raise the sanctuaries of the island above their station as provincial and even rustic temples, constructed and decorated by a community of peasants, fishermen, and small traders. The great want of the Maltese was not material resources but refined taste; they had plenty of excellent stone, stone which at the present day is exported to Tunis and there largely employed, but they were without the models and practical instruction in their use which the natives of Cyprus owed to their proximity to Egypt, to Syria, and to the cities of Greece.

§ 4.—*The Temples of Sicily and Carthage.*

While, by a singular chance, Malta and Gozo have handed down to us several Phœnician temples in which both the general arrangements and not a few accessories of the cult may still be traced, nothing remains of the far richer and more important sanctuaries raised by the Syrians, and still more by their Carthaginian cousins, on the shores of Sicily. The existence of these shrines is proved only by numerous passages in ancient authors and by the existence of a few votive steles, the last remains of the mass of votive offerings accumulated in them by the piety of many generations. Nothing is left of the famous temple in which Astarte was worshipped as *Erek-Hayim*, literally "long-life," that

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. Nos. 122 and 122 *bis*.

is to say the "goddess who gives a long life," whence the name Eryx, given to the town by the Greeks of Sicily and used by all the classic writers. Of this temple we know only that it was built on the very top of the mountain, within a strong wall which crowned its slopes and defended its summit (Fig. 34). Of the vast collection of monuments which it must have possessed the only thing that has survived is a stele with an inscription referring to some building executed within its precincts by a certain Himilco, son of Baaljatho.[1]

Lilybæum, on the site of the modern Marsala, seems to have had a temple to Ammon; this we infer from a curious stele quite recently discovered (Fig. 232).[2] It bears a short dedication signed by a personage calling himself Hanno, son of Adonbaal. But the chief interest of the monument lies in the bas-relief on its upper part. In the middle of the field stands one of those candelabra of which we have already given examples taken from Carthaginian steles (Figs. 82 and 83); to the left is the sacred cone, here represented with head and arms as on the coins of certain Asiatic towns; near the cone stands a caduceus, on the right there is a man adoring. He is dressed in a robe falling to the feet and gathered in a band about the waist; a pointed cap is on his head. The whole thing is without value as a work of art, but it gives a good idea of the Phœnician costume, a costume which resembles that still worn in the Levant by those Greek, Syrian, and Armenian merchants who have not yet adopted the costume of Europe.[3]

Several votive inscriptions have been found in Sardinia which allow us to infer that there were Phœnician sanctuaries on that island also;[4] they bear the names *Baal Samaïm* or *Baal of the skies*, of *Astarte-Erek-Hayim*, of *Esmoun*, of *Baal-Ammon*, of *Elat*. Some steles, found mostly in the tombs of Sulcis, confirm this conjecture. On many of them Astarte may be recognised as a female figure in a long robe and an Egyptian head-dress. She

[1] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. No. 135. The text of the inscription has, unfortunately, been lost for the last two hundred years, and we know it only by two ancient copies which leave much to be desired.

[2] *Ibid.* No. 138.

[3] Conf. the worshipper on the Carthaginian stele figured above (fig. 13) and another on a stele given below (Fig. 305).

[4] *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, pars i. Nos. 139-141, 143, 147-149, 151.

holds the lunar disk in both hands and appears to offer it for adoration. One of these steles must date from the very commencement of the Phœnician occupation (Fig. 233); its base is like a truncated pyramid or one of the towers of a pylon; the

FIG. 232.—Stele from Lilybæum. *Corpus*, plate 29.

pedestal on which the goddess stands and the pavilion under which she is sheltered have the same form, while the whole is crowned with a frieze of uræi. The upper gorge bears a globe

without wings. The same arrangement is found in many other steles, but with variations and differences in execution which prove that all these monuments by no means belong to the same century.[1] In any case this worship and the divine type consecrated by it had not fallen into disuse even at the time of the Roman conquest; this is proved by several steles which, by their chronological order, would come at the end of the series. The columns which enframe the pavilion are classic, but in one stele at least motives entirely Phœnician are mingled with the distinctive features of the Ionic order (Fig. 193). The winged globe occupies the centre of a cornice with a purely Greek profile, but



FIG. 233.—Stele from Sulcis. Height 28 inches. From Crespi.

above that cornice again appears a row of uræi. In another stele from the same place (Fig. 194), we are inclined to see a relic of the worship of Baal-Hammon. High in the field we see a disk embraced by a crescent; lower down, an animal walking to the left. This animal certainly looks more like a sheep than a ram; it has no horns, but their absence may be explained by the general roughness of the work.

Nothing has been found that we can recognize as ruins of the buildings in which these gods were adored. The temple of

[1] CRESPI, *Catalogo*, plate I. Nos. 1, 8, 10, and 11.

Melkart at Gades had a great reputation in the time of Strabo,[1] but now we do not even know its site.

In Carthaginian Africa no temples earlier than the Roman Conquest have been found, but various signs prove that it possessed buildings whose decorations had certain features in common with those in other parts of greater Phœnicia. Here, for instance,



FIG. 234.—Lintel at Ebba. Limestone. Height 55 inches.

is a lintel which is at present doing duty as a doorpost at Ebba, to the south of Kef (Fig. 234). The sockets for the hinges may still be traced. But the curious thing about it is that it bears, between two lotus buds, those symbols to which we have already drawn

[1] STRABO, iii. v. 3, 5, 9.

attention as a kind of blazon proper to Phœnician art, the solar disk—here with a crown of rays—and the crescent moon. In a neighbouring district, at Djezza, among the ruins of a Byzantine fort, a very curious and original capital may be seen (Fig. 235). It is of the Ionic order but the familiar elements are arranged in very novel fashion. The proportions are neither Greek nor Roman. The volutes are applied to the faces of a cubical calathos, from which they do not stand out on any side. The hollow beneath the egg moulding may once have been filled with a bronze astragal. The influence of classic types is here very strong but in its broad effect this capital is like nothing so much

FIG. 235.—Capital at Djezza. Limestone. Drawn by Saladin. Height with astragal 20 inches. Diameter of the lower part 18 inches.

as those Cypriot caps of which we have already given so many examples (Figs. 51-53).[1]

Even at Carthage itself there is no more satisfaction for our curiosity. Taken twice by the Romans, all buildings anterior to the victory of Scipio have utterly disappeared. Its demolition was begun by order of the senate in 146, and, under the empire, it was rebuilt in the style of the time upon the ancient site. For a century and a half the ruins of Carthage served as a quarry for

[1] We owe our thanks to M. Saladin for the drawings of these two fragments. The faces of the capital are not parallel, and the one here shown is richer than either of the remaining three.

the neighbouring cities, and when its reconstruction was determined on, such of the ancient materials as remained were either reworked and impressed with the taste of the day or dispersed far and wide. Some of them might, no doubt, be recovered, if the excavations, formerly begun by Beulé, were taken up and prosecuted with sufficient energy. But as for the real Punic temples, the buildings which saw Hamilcar and Hannibal within their gates, it is not likely that even if the site were explored down to the very rock anything but a few chips of mouldings and other unimportant *débris* would be recovered.

Of all the great temples of Punic Carthage the only one whose site appears to be fixed by ancient texts and modern discoveries is that of Esmoun, which is called the temple of Æsculapius in documents of the empire.[1] It was in the heart of the city, upon the hill, Byrsa, which served as an acropolis. Unhappily its site is now covered by the church of St. Louis and its dependencies; but neither in the works undertaken when that church was built nor in the excavations of Beulé was anything found which could be said to date from the primitive building; all the fragments dug up belong certainly to the new Corinthian temple of white marble built under the Roman emperors. Its style was that of the Roman structures raised in the first century of our era. Nothing seems to have survived of the temple in which, on the supreme day of Carthage, nine hundred Roman deserters intrenched themselves with Hasdrubal, and when betrayed by him defended themselves to the last extremity. This temple was the richest and most beautiful in Carthage.[2] It faced eastwards, and was built on the edge of the plateau by the side of the great public square near the harbours. It was reached by a staircase of sixty steps, but if danger threatened it the staircase could easily be destroyed, for it merely rested against the perpendicular wall of the acropolis.

The site was admirably chosen, and we should much like to know how it was treated by the architect. The hill on which the temple stood rose about 200 feet above the sea level; it dominated the whole city, and must have had a great effect upon those who sailed into its shadow and allowed their eyes to mount the wide steps with which it communicated with the streets below. Whether

[1] BEULÉ, *Fouilles à Carthage*, pp. 9, 10, 44, 51, 75.

[2] APPIAN, viii. 130; Μάλιστα τῶν ἄλλων ἐπίφανες καὶ πλούσιον.

it guarded any strongly marked signs of its oriental descent down to the day when it disappeared in the conflagration lighted by its own defenders we cannot now say; neither can we tell how far its walls extended nor what the dimensions of the temple proper, the *naos*, may have been. As for the other shrines in the Punic town all that we know about them is that the temple of Baal-Hammon was in the Forum,[1] and that of Tanit upon a hill separated from the Byrsa by one of the principal streets.[2] This hill was not so high as the Byrsa, but it offered nearly as large a platform, and several temples of secondary importance were grouped about the sanctuary of the goddess who was the real patroness of Carthage, and who, as the *Virgo Cælestis*, or Juno, preserved that *rôle* down to the very last days of paganism.

§ 5.—*On the General Characteristics of the Phœnician Temple.*

We have spared no pains to follow up the slightest traces of every temple built by the Phœnicians on the coast of Syria itself, and in the islands and on the shores of the Mediterranean, wherever they had permanent colonies. In our search disappointments have been frequent. Literary and epigraphic texts are too short and vague to give much information. Bas-reliefs often show the altar, the sacred emblem and the officiating priest well enough, but they abridge the temple very sternly indeed. As for the ruins themselves, it often happens that, as at the *Maabed* of Amrit, the arrangements about which we feel most curiosity have disappeared and left no sign. In Cyprus the ruins are in better condition, and perhaps when they are systematically explored they may tell us

[1] Beulé, *Fouilles à Carthage*, pp. 31 and 81.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 9, 26, 27. Between this hill and the sea, and between the former and the water tanks, all those votive steles consecrated to *Tanit, face of Baal*, were found. Of these there are ninety in the British Museum and more than two thousand at Paris; the latter are due to the excavations of M. de Sainte-Marie. Most of them were found at the sides of the hollow, hedge-bordered road, which runs from the sea and passes between the Byrsa and the hill on which the temple of Tanit is supposed to have stood. It is likely that this road follows the line of one of the principal streets of ancient Carthage. Almost all the steles are broken; those which are intact are about twenty-four inches high. As a rule they are rough at their lower extremity, which seems to prove that they were planted in the ground. Their backs are roughly dressed.

all we want to know. At Malta and Gozo, where the remains are clear enough, we are in presence of buildings of the second or third class which cannot be taken as worthy representatives of the national architecture.

But in spite of the scantiness of these data, the individuality of the Phœnician, or rather of the Semitic, temple, stands out with sufficient distinctness to allow the historian to grasp its salient features. It is distinguished from the most familiar of our types, that of Greece and Rome, by one capital difference; it attaches much less importance to the *cella*, the chamber in which the image or symbol of the god is placed. It consists of a great court, or open-air hall, in the centre of which, or at one extremity, rises a tabernacle or pavilion with the emblem of divine power beneath its shelter. In Greece the attention of the architect was concentrated on the cella, the home of the god, the dwelling-place of his often colossal statue; in Phœnicia the symbol was, as a rule, of no great size. The grandiose feature of the Semitic temple was the *περιβολή*, the courtyard with its continuous portico, which in some cases included a fine order and a rich scheme of decoration.

Even now the Semitic race is not without places of worship in which the general arrangement is much the same as this. In the first place, there are old mosques at Cairo, those of Amrou and Touloun, for instance, where great quadrangles are surrounded by single- or double-aisled colonnades, and nothing is wanting but the idol. But if we go to Mecca we shall find the type in all its completeness in the mosque of the Caaba (Fig. 236). Even the triumph of the Koran has not abolished the betyle, and there, standing in the centre of the wide inclosure, the mystic stone has received for centuries the homage of the Arab tribes.[1]

The primitive form of worship of these peoples was the *courban*, or sacrifice offered on a high place, which is still practised near Mecca on the occasion of the great pilgrimage. At first their temple was no more than a clearing of levelled earth at the top of

[1] Our view of Mecca and the mosque of the Caaba is from a drawing by M. Tomaszkiewicz after a photograph by Colonel Sadik-Bey, for which we have to thank M. G. Schlumberger. The *black stone* itself is not visible; it is a rounded mass of basalt, framed in silver and let into one of the angles of the *Caaba* or *Beit Allah* (house of God). The Caaba is the cubic mass, 37 feet high, which stands in the middle of the square, and is draped in the black veil called the *tob-el-Caaba* (shirt of the Caaba). See on this subject ALI BEY BEN ABBASSI, *Voyage*, vol. ii. pp. 348-351.

FIG. 236.—View of the great Mosque at Mecca.

a hill, where the altar of sacrifice was raised within a belt of trees. As civilization advanced, and the religious notions of the people became more complex, the Phœnicians borrowed from the Egyptians the idea of a tabernacle in which to lodge their fetish; it was Egypt that taught them to raise their sanctuary in the middle of the consecrated area, the *haram*. Thus far the Phœnician temple is founded upon that of Egypt, but it never seems to have been a servile copy. It was not hidden, like the buildings at Luxor and Karnak, behind a huge wall; it had no labyrinth of dimly-lighted chambers lying between the sanctuary and the outer air; perhaps through want of skill rather than want of inclination Phœnicia substituted wide courts for the hypostyle halls of the Pharaohs.

In spite of its simplicity the Semitic type of religious building had a grandeur and nobility of its own; it was the first type to meet the pioneers of Greek civilization; the Æolians and Ionians found it in Cilicia, in Syria, in Cyprus and in the other islands in which they came into contact with the Phœnicians. They began by borrowing from it, and even when, by their own genius, they had created an entirely new system of religious architecture, their buildings still preserved some traces of these early lessons. We may thus explain a peculiarity of classic architecture which had hardly received all the attention it deserves; the περιβολὴ is much more important in the Greek temples of Asia than in those of Europe. It is only in Asiatic temples like those of Magnesia and Ephesus, of Miletus and Samos, that we meet with these vast and richly decorated quadrangles. There was nothing of the kind at the Parthenon, at Ægina or at Phigalia. Whether the Ionians were directly inspired by the oriental type, or whether they took possession of temples built by their predecessors on the coast, as they are supposed to have done at Ephesus, is of slight importance;[1] the great thing to remember is that in certain temples belonging to this country signs of Semitic influence are to be traced even at the height of the classic period. And the likeness was not only in the arrangement of the building. The

[1] On this question see the learned and ingenious paper by E. Curtius, entitled *Beitræge zur Geschichte und Topographie Kleinasiens* (*Ephesos, Pergamon, Smyrna, Sardes*) in verbindung mit den Herrn Major Regely, Baurath Adler, Dr. Hirschfeld und Dr. Gelzer; 4to, 7 plates; Dummler (extracted from the Proceedings of the Berlin Academy).

Ephesian Artemis was the sister of the Phœnician Astarte, she was in fact the same nature goddess under another name.[1] The two conceptions being almost identical, is it surprising that the rites had much in common, and that a similar community may be traced in the buildings in which those rites were performed?

From the artistic point of view the temples of Phœnicia seem far inferior to those of Egypt or Greece, but if we remember how a practical and industrious people like the Phœnicians, a people, too, who were fond of all that wealth can give, must have crowded their shrines with all that was rich and splendid, we shall understand what an impression such temples as those of Idalion and Golgos, of Amathus, of Paphos and Cythera, must have made on the still half-barbarous ancestors of the Greeks. The western visitors were transported by what they saw, and centuries afterwards the poetry of Greece showed by the epithets it lavished on the fair Aphrodite how profound had been the impression made by her gorgeous sanctuaries in the East.

In his work devoted to Cyprus, Engel has made use of his rare knowledge of ancient literature to collect every passage in a classic author in which there is any allusion to the Cyprian form of worship;[2] Movers has done the same for Phœnicia. Collate these texts with the figured monuments which have travelled from Syria and Cyprus into our western museums, and you will have a bright vision of a whole vanished world, of Byblos and Paphos with their temples and sacred groves.

In the first place you will see the wide quadrangles with their shady porticoes, with their pavilion of the god rising above a moving throng of worshippers, of image and amulet merchants, which filled them from morning to night. Here and there you may see pressing through the crowd the sellers of those sacred statuettes which pilgrims used to buy and take back to their homes. Athenæus has preserved the story of a miracle accomplished by one of these little figures; following Polycharmus of Naucratis he tells us how a ship on which a native of that city was taking one of the figures in question back to his home was saved from destruction in a storm by the goddess it represented.[3]

[1] See ERNEST CURTIUS, *Die Griechische Götterlehre von Geschichtlichem Standpunct*, 8vo, 1875 (reprinted from vol. xxxvi. of the *Preussiche Jahrbücher*).

[2] ENGEL, *Kypros*, 2 vols. 8vo, 1841, Berlin.

[3] ATHENÆUS, XV. xviii.

Under a burning sky the coolness of deep shadow and the freshness of falling water are the most delightful of luxuries; they are, in fact, necessities. We may therefore suppose that in these quadrangles there were sparkling fountains with basins hollowed in the pavement, and drooping planes thrusting their roots through the humid soil beneath. Water was required for ablutions and sacrifices, and for quenching the thirst of the crowd of priests and priestesses who lived in the temple and its precincts, and of the countless pilgrims who flocked to it at certain times by land and sea. This water must have been brought from the sides of the neighbouring hills. On the Syrian coast, where the snows and springs of the Lebanon fed innumerable torrents, this was easy enough. In Cyprus it was a more difficult matter. There water had to be brought often from a great distance, in subterranean conduits cut in the rock. Traces of these conduits are to be found in all parts of the island. They are carried across valleys in siphons.[1] To the eastern traveller who has seen Turkish or Persian mosques with their sparkling fountains and majestic trees, it is not difficult to call up a picture of what the great sanctuary of Paphos must have been to one coming upon it after a long climb up the wooded slopes of the hill on which it stood.[2]

The temples had festivals corresponding to the changes of the seasons. In the more celebrated among them, in those of Paphos, Byblos and Eryx, the thing worshipped was really the energy shown by nature in destroying and reproducing life in the world, in repairing by a continual process of generation the losses caused by death. In those times men followed the never-ending, ever-beginning drama of life with a sympathy and sensibility that we in these days have some difficulty in understanding. In winter the languor, the mourning of nature, affected their souls; they wept the death of Adonis, of the young solar god who had been taken from a world of which he was the charm and ornament. With the return of spring, in the first days of April, their delight in the

[1] Cesnola found traces of these aqueducts near Amathus, Curium, Citium, Throni, and, he says, in one or two places in the north of the island (*Cyprus*, pp. 187, 341).

[2] The precincts of the temple were probably inhabited by crowds of white pigeons, the favoured bird of Aphrodite. In the courtyard of the great mosque at Mecca there are more than two thousand doves, which are looked upon as belonging to the Cherif. Pilgrims buy grain for them, and to feed them is looked upon as an imperative duty for all who visit the sanctuary (Ali Bey, vol. ii. p. 367).

renewed energies of themselves and of everything about them broke out in unrestrained transports, in dancing and singing and abandoned orgies. They welcomed the reawakened sun and the sympathetic heat it kindled in their own veins. In such a cult those religious prostitutions which formed one of the chief characteristics of Syrian worship had their natural place. The *hieroduli* of Paphos were no less famous than those of Corinth, while the latter were influenced by Syrian ideas and religious traditions.

In the sacred inclosure and its dependencies everything spoke to the senses; the air was full of perfume, of soft and caressing sounds, the murmur of falling water, the song of the nightingale, and the voluptuous cooing of the dove mingled with the rippling notes of the flute, the instrument which sounded the call to pleasure, or led the bride and bridegroom to the wedding feast. Under tents or light shelters built of branches skilfully interlaced, dwelt the slaves of the goddess, those who were called by Pindarus in the scoliast composed for Theoxenius of Corinth, the *servants of the persuasion.* These are Greek or Syrian girls, covered with jewels and dressed in rich stuffs with bright-coloured fringes. Their black and glossy tresses were twisted up in *mitras,* or scarves of brilliant colour, while natural flowers such as pinks, roses, and pomegranate blossoms hung over their foreheads. Their eyes glittered under the arch of wide eyebrows made still wider by art; the freshness of their lips and cheeks was heightened by carmine; necklaces of gold, amber and glass, hung between their swelling breasts; with the pigeon, the emblem of fertility, in one hand, and a flower or myrtle-branch in the other, these women sat and waited.

CHAPTER V.

CIVIL ARCHITECTURE.

§ 1.—*Fortified Walls.*

The Phœnicians had little imagination. No doubt the terrors of death were present to their minds; they attacked the problem of human destiny and solved it in their own way; their religion—a religion entirely made up of rites and ceremonies—counted for something in their lives, and they sought to propitiate their gods by such sacrifices as the immolation of their first-born children. The pious Phœnician held it a matter of honour that his account with Heaven should leave a balance in his favour, but he did not torment himself with mystic dreams. Neither at Tyre nor Carthage did they lose much time in speculating upon the origin or the end of things; their imaginations were busied less over questions of the future than over those of the present; the energy of the Phœnician genius was directed rather to utilitarian ends than to the search for what was grandiose or beautiful. That being the humour of the people as a whole, the energy of their constructors must have been devoted mainly to works having for their object the provision of spacious ports, of ample quays and strong defensive works for the cities in which their industries were carried on, and, finally, to the provision of convenient dwellings. Engineers, as we should call them, had more to do in Phœnicia than architects, and yet neither in Syria nor in Phœnician Africa do we find anything but feeble traces of engineering works, either civil or military.

The various sources to which we can turn for information as to the tombs of the Phœnicians and their temples do not help us when we come to inquire into their methods of securing their

cities against an enemy and their dwellings against discomfort. The structures raised to these ends were exposed to the same danger of ruin as temples, while in spite of the services they rendered, they had far less importance in the eyes of contemporary writers and artists. Classic authors only make passing allusion to them, and it is rare that remains of any importance supplement the silence or insufficiency of the texts.

All Phœnician cities were fortified. Although the Phœnicians were masters of the sea for so many centuries, we have seen that the Philistines contrived to capture Sidon by a bold *coup-de-main*, and the lesson of the disaster was taken to heart. It proved that even the maritime quays and harbours required fortifications, which were still more necessary to the cities on land. Egyptians, Assyrians, Chaldæans, Persians and Greeks, must all in turn have been tempted by the riches accumulated in these seaboard towns—towns which were not all so favourably placed as Tyre and Arvad. Those on the mainland were vastly more exposed to hostile attempts, but even Tyre, as the success of Alexander proved, was not quite beyond the reach of an enemy. The cities of Phœnicia were, then, embraced by huge walls of defence, at whose construction we are enabled to guess by the remains still to be seen at Arvad and Sidon (Figs. 7 and 41).

The *enceinte* of Tyre was especially strong. This we know from the stubborn resistance which it offered for seven months to the attacks of Alexander, delivered with all the dash of an ever-victorious army.[1] Practically there is nothing left of the ramparts which so long defied the great conqueror. "I do not think," says M. Renan, "that any city having played for centuries a prominent *rôle* in the world has left feebler traces than Tyre." Ezekiel was a true prophet when he said to Tyre: "Though thou be sought for, yet shalt thou never be found again."[2] A traveller who should sail along the Syrian coast between Kasmie and Ras-el-Ain without knowing exactly where he was, would never guess that he was abreast of the site of an ancient city.[3] The only fragment of Phœnician building which M. Renan thought he could recognize at Sour was a wall, now below the sea-level, which had

[1] DIODORUS, xvii. 46; PLUTARCH, *Alexander*, 24.
[2] EZEKIEL, xxvi. 21.
[3] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 529.

served to uphold a quay built out into the water. The southern ramparts must have stood on the quay in question; it is formed of huge blocks of stone filled in with a concrete or beton full of broken bricks and potsherds.[1]

We must then form our idea of this *enceinte* from the evidence of ancient writers. According to Arrian it was 150 feet high on the land side; its thickness was in proportion to its height, and the huge blocks were held together by mortar.[2] This last detail seems doubtful; the few Phœnician walls of which fragments remain are built of dry stones; but the submarine wall described by M. Renan has all the characteristics attributed by the historian to the walls of Tyre; it is possible that when the Tyrians found what good results they could obtain by such a process, they made use of it in their *enceinte*, which must often have been repaired and under-pinned.

The wall was flanked with towers, and the king's palace was backed against it. The roofs of the latter communicated directly with the covered way that ran the whole length of the curtain; this we gather from Arrian's account of the assault which put an end to Tyrian independence.[3] We have already met with the same arrangement in Assyria, at Khorsabad.[4]

The ramparts of Sidon and Arvad, of which some imposing fragments still remain, have left no traces in history; they had not the luck to hold the victor of Issus and Arbela in check for a whole winter. It is, again, in accounts of the siege of Tyre that we read of Phœnician skill in the contrivance and management of military engines. The engineers of Alexander, who had won their reputation in the campaigns of Phillip, met their match in those of Tyre.[5] On both sides the greatest fertility of invention and energy in execution had already been displayed when Alexander committed himself to the stupendous task of building his famous mole.[6] In this respect the siege of Tyre was a preface

[1] *Mission*, pp. 535, 560, 561. See also the plan given at page 531.

[2] ARRIAN, *Anabasis*, II. xxi. 3. Ἦν δὲ αὐτοῖς τὰ τείχη κατὰ τὸ χῶμα, τό τε ὕψος εἰς πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν μάλιστα πόδας καὶ ἐς πλάτος ξύμμετρον, λίθοις μεγάλοις ἐν γύψῳ κειμένοις ξυμπεπηγότα.

[3] ARRIAN, *Anabasis*, II. xxiii. 6.

[4] *Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, vol. ii. p. 11, and plate i.

[5] Upon the Macedonian engineers of the school of Polyidus, see J. G. DROYSEN, *Geschichte des Hellenismus* (two vols. Hamburgh, 1836-1843), vol. i. p. 291, note 1.

[6] DIODORUS, xvii. xli. 3; xliii. 1.

to that great siege of Rhodes in which Demetrius Poliorcetes won his surname.

In order to find a stronghold whose ramparts were not reconstructed by the Franks established in Syria at the time of the Crusades, we must quit those parts of the country in which life has always been most active and, as a consequence, most fatal to the relics of the past; we must travel northwards, into the district of the Arvadites. It was a little outside the path of invasion; the neighbourhoods of the ancient sites were free from modern cities, like Beyrout and Saïda, Sour and Acre, and, as we have seen from the tombs, the antique remains are there in better condition than in the districts south and west of the Lebanon. Towards the northern boundary of the region which formerly depended upon Arvad, there is, near a small village called Banias, a city rampart still standing for almost its whole length.[1] Situated out of the beaten track, it had never drawn attention until quite lately; we borrow a map of the site, as well as a partial view of the wall, from M. Camille Favre the first traveller to notice it.[2]

Banias is about twenty-five miles north of Arvad, it is the ancient Balanea, the *Valania* of the Crusades. The ruins of the Græco-Roman city are not of much importance; little is to be seen but a few substructures, which, being in the neighbourhood of abundant springs, represent most likely the baths from which the village took its name.[3]

A short distance westward of these springs and higher up the river, about a mile and a half from the sea, there stands a rampart which still rises many feet above the plain for the whole of its length (Fig. 237). The space it embraces is, roughly speaking, an elongated triangle, one of its long sides being formed by the wall in question, and the other two by a ravine whose northern face is an inaccessible precipice; it will be seen therefore, that the site was well chosen for defence. Not counting its bastions the wall is about 670 yards in total length. At its two extremities it ends close to the precipice in a sort of returning angle, which is particularly well marked on the eastern face. The rampart is

[1] STRABO places Balaneum on what he calls "the coast subject to the Arvadites."

[2] C. FAVRE, *Banias* (*Balanée*) *et son enceinte cyclopéenne* (*Revue archéologique*, 2nd series, vol. xxxvii. pp. 223-232, and plate viii.).

[3] Βαλανεῖον means *public bath, bathing establishment.*

pierced at three points by openings varying from 25 to 35 feet wide. There is no trace either of lintels or door-posts. The passage must have been barred by wooden gates set in timber frames. To the left of the north-western gate the salience of the wall with its triple face almost deserves to be called a tower. Elsewhere the trace is more simple; the constructor has been satisfied with mere redans, but his determination to bring an attacking enemy under the full fire—if we may use the word— of the



FIG. 237.—Plan of the rampart near Banias.

garrison is always evident. Moreover there is, between the gates, a series of salient and re-entering angles, and they flank each other; but they seem to have been dictated by the configuration of the soil. Except about the north-western gate the ground is everywhere higher within the rampart than it is outside, so that the fortification is not commanded from any point in its near vicinity. The high ground within was cut into terraces and

retained by scarps; one of these is shown in our woodcut, which represents the part of the wall abutting on the north-western gate.

The present height of the wall itself, varies between 16 and 35 feet; it is built of roughly squared blocks of grey limestone; of these the largest are about 40 inches long and 30 high. They are fixed without cement, but the wider joints are filled up with small stones. There is not the slightest sign of mortar. The most remarkable thing about this rampart as a piece of masonry, is the pains taken by the builder to preserve his horizontal courses in spite of the roughness of his units. In other respects the setting of the stones is not good; the vertical joints often

Fig. 238.—The Phœnician wall near Banias.

coincide. The thickness of the wall varies between 16 and 27 feet, so that it would afford standing room for a strong force of defenders, in case of an attempt at an escalade. Even where the wall seems to have lost none of its original heights there is no sign of a parapet of any kind. It must have been built at a time when military engineering was still in its infancy. The only siege machine whose antiquity might equal that of this rampart, is the battering ram, which, as we have seen, appeared in Assyria as early as the eighth century,[1] and against its blows a wall would have to trust only to its mass. The main attack would be directed against the gates, in the hope of forcing them from their hinges.

[1] See *Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, Vol. I. Fig. 26.

We have already hinted as to how this danger was provided for; thus, at the north-eastern gate the besiegers would find themselves squeezed into a narrow passage between the precipice and the bastion-shaped end of the wall; while before they could get within striking distance of the gates giving upon the plateau, they would have to advance between salient angles of the wall for some thirty or forty yards.

The traveller who has here been our guide considers this rampart to be the work of Pelasgians. But who were the Pelasgians? That term has no real meaning for the historian unless it signifies the fathers of the Hellens and Italiots, the oldest and first established in Europe of those tribes whose descendants were to speak Greek and Latin. Now can any text be named from which we may infer that one of these Aryan tribes ever dwelt upon the Syrian coast, and dwelt there in such a permanent fashion that they built fortified cities? There is nothing to show that the Pelasgians even made a flying visit to these shores. On the other hand nothing could be more natural than the existence of a Phœnician stronghold at this point; it may well have been the northern covering fortress for that Arvadite kingdom whose borders stretched eastward to the Orontes and southward to Orthosia. Banias is only ten leagues from Antarados, and unmistakable traces of Phœnician worship have been found still farther, on Mount Casius, for instance, which rises close to the mouth of the Orontes.

Moreover there is nothing foreign to the habits of the Phœnician builder in the character of the wall itself. The stones are not so large as at Arvad, but as a whole the physiognomy of the work is quite similar; we find in both the same horizontality of the courses and the same coincidence of the vertical joints.

Neither at Kition nor at any other Cypriot town of Phœnician origin has any well-preserved rampart yet been found which can be ascribed to Syrian builders.[1] But if we cross the sea and seek them in one of those islands in which first the Syrians and afterwards their heirs, the Carthaginians, established themselves so strongly, we shall be more successful. Mount Eryx, at the western extremity of Sicily, played for three centuries a capital

[1] Cesnola tells us that at Golgos he found the remains of the ancient wall, but he neither reproduces the fragments nor gives us any details as to their workmanship (*Cyprus*, p. 109).

rôle in the struggle waged by Carthage first against the Greek cities and secondly against the armies of Rome. Close to the excellent harbour of Drepanum, Eryx rises to a height of about 2,350 feet above a rich and fertile plain. On its summit stood a temple of Astarte, the platform being artificially enlarged by embanking; this was a work of some difficulty and was ascribed by the Greeks to Dædalus.[1] Below the temple, on the side next the sea, the houses of the town rose in stages one above another. The Carthaginians were not content with fortifying the temple and the city, they drew a line of circumvallation round the whole base of the mountain. Their ramparts thus inclosed a space wide enough to shelter a large army, which was put beyond fear of thirst by numerous springs. Neither these works nor the remains of the zigzag road which led up from the sea-shore to the top of the mountain have yet been thoroughly explored, but a learned



FIG. 239.—Plan of the Phœnician wall at Eryx. From Salinas.

archæologist, Signor Salinas, has recently made a study of that section of the wall which lies to the north-west of Monte San-Giuliano.[2] The wall by which this little modern town is embraced coincides in that direction with the ramparts of Carthaginian Eryx. The upper sections have been reconstructed again and again, but all the lower courses of the ancient wall are still in place and bear the mark of the Phœnician masons;[3] even the modern gateways stand upon the antique sites.

On this north-western side the wall of Eryx is still standing for a distance of about 1,100 yards (Fig. 239). The irregularity of its trace is to be explained by the necessity under which its

[1] DIODORUS, IV. lxviii. 4; POLYBIUS, I. lv. 6, 9; lviii. 2; VIRGIL, *Æneid*, v. 759; STRABO, VI. ii. 6.

[2] A. SALINAS, *Le Mura fenicie di Erice* (Roma, 1883, in 4to, 8 pages and 3 plates).

[3] See above, Figs. 34 and 35.

designer found himself of following the contours of the hill-side. The wall is about eight feet thick; it is broken at unequal distances by rectangular towers standing out very boldly from the curtain (see Figs. 34 and 240). The chief care of the architect seems to have been given to these towers, which are built of much larger units than the curtain; it is only in the towers that we find stones six feet long.[1] The outer faces of these large blocks are quite in the rough, but elsewhere the stones are

FIG. 240.—One of the towers of Eryx. From Cavallari.

better worked and more carefully squared. Salinas has noted these differences, but his attention is chiefly taken up with a curious feature to be found both in that part of the structure where large units are employed and in the part where the stones are small. The courses vary in height; but once the height of a course is determined by the corner stone, the Phœnician builders

[1] The only block of which M. Salinas gives the exact size is 5 feet 8 inches long by 4 feet high.

have exercised great ingenuity in preserving its level. The mason often had to make use of stones of a different height from those placed at the end of the course; in that case he made up for the difference by introducing small stones, so that each course was built up as it were like a wall in itself. Such masonry no doubt leaves much to be desired. It cannot be compared to a Greek wall of the fine period, where every unit was carefully prepared for the exact place it had to occupy. To form a right appreciation of this way of building, the walls of Eryx must not be compared to those of Messene but to those of Tiryns or to any other Greek or Italian wall on the face of which the joints describe a network of irregular polygons. There is, in fact, real progress in the tendency to horizontal courses which we find at Balanea as at Arvad, at Sidon as at Eryx; it is the mark of an advancing industry, of a taste just beginning to feel the sentiment of order and the subtle charm of symmetry.

The chief gateways through this wall have been so much altered that we can only guess how they may have been arranged in antiquity, but the posterns at the foot of some of the towers are better preserved (B, C, E, F on the plan). They are of two different types. Some have a rectangular opening bridged over by a heavy stone lintel (Fig. 241). In others the opening is arched, the arch being obtained by a device of which we found many examples in Egypt.[1] Our two views of this postern show that the arrangement of the masonry is not the same on both faces. On the outside the semi-circle of the arch is cut through two stones large enough to leave plenty of material above the void and thus to guarantee solidity (Fig. 242). On the internal face there are four stones corbelled out one beyond the other, the two uppermost so thin that we are astonished to find them unbroken beneath the weight that rests upon them (Fig. 242).

The rampart of Eryx cannot be so old as the walls of Banias, Arvad, and Sidon. The Sicilian constructor seems to have progressed in his art. His joints are better placed. Instead of being one over the other they are, as a rule, over the middle, or something like it, of the stone below. Again we find small stones used in the curtain beside the masonry of much larger units of which the towers are composed. These are indications of a later age and are confirmed by the history of Phœnician colonization. As

[1] *Art in Ancient Egypt*, Vol. I., Figs. 74-76; Vol. II., Figs. 51-53.

we have seen, the Tyrian settlements in the west were little more than factories, whose safety depended rather upon their friendly relations with the native tribes than upon military strength, so that the walls of Eryx must date from the time when Carthage took up the work of Tyre.[1] It was not till then that the necessities of a new political situation compelled the great African city to construct this vast intrenched camp, a camp excellently contrived

FIG. 241.—Postern in the wall of Eryx. From Salinas.

either for preparing an advance in force or for covering a retreat. The walls of Eryx can hardly have been commenced earlier than

[1] At the meeting of the Berlin Archæological Society on November 6th, 1883, Herr Sachau, in speaking of the paper of Salinas, drew attention to the fact that the mason's marks found so far on the walls of Eryx were not enough to give a date to that structure. The *ain* certainly was shaped as in the oldest Phœnician writings, but before any certain conclusion could be arrived at from the study of these characters we must wait, said Herr Sachau, until other letters such as *mim* and *shin*, whose forms were greatly modified by time, have been found (*Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1st December, 1883, p. 1).

the first years of the fifth century, and it is likely that between that date and the first Punic war they were often enlarged and repaired. In 260 Hamilcar destroyed the town and transferred its inhabitants to Drepanum, but he certainly did not raze the fortifications, and in after years the dispersed population came back and re-established themselves round the sanctuary. Upon a Roman penny of the Considia family we find both temple and rampart figured (Fig. 244). The former stands upon some rocks which are meant to represent the summit of the mountain; in front there is a wall ending in quadrangular towers, and having in the

FIG. 242.—Postern in the wall of Eryx. From Salinas. Outside view.

centre an arched doorway flanked by round towers. This coin is contemporary with Cicero.

Solunte, built on a high hill close to the sea, and Motya, seem both to have had a wall built after the same fashion as that of Eryx. The rampart at Motya is the more regular and the better preserved of the two (Fig. 245). This town was built on the western coast, on a small island separated from the mainland by a channel about eight or nine hundred yards wide. This choice of a site appears to suggest a very old Phœnician colony. The

modern name of the place is San Pantaleone. The stones are of great size and are set in regular courses, without cement. There are, or at least there were at the end of the last century, two very well preserved towers on the western side. The base of the *enceinte* was washed by the sea, and the place, as a whole, must have been very strong.[1]

We may be told that in Sicily the Phœnicians had Greek walls to copy from, and that they may even have employed Greek workmen, either seduced by bribes or chosen from among the prisoners of war and compelled to use their skill for the benefit of their masters.

FIG. 243.—Postern in the wall of Eryx. From Salinas. Inside view.

But this idea is discredited by the fact that in a country never reached by Grecian navigators, in that Mauritania Tingitana, as the Romans called it, which we know as Morocco, we find masonry carried out upon the same system as in these Sicilian

[1] Speaking of Solunte, SERRA DI FALCO mentions a wall "di grossi macigni squadrati"; but he gives no drawing of it (*Le Antichita della Sicilia*, vol. v. p. 60); he is content with giving a view of the site, in which the ruins themselves are hardly visible. The fortifications of Motya are represented in HOUEL, *Voyage pittoresque des Iles de Sicile, de Malte, et de Lipari* (4 vols. folio, Paris, 1782-1785, vol. i. p. 17, plate ix.).

walls. Of this the best instance is afforded by the curious ruins of Lix, the Lixus of Greek and Latin geographers. Lix was a Phœnician colony, as we know from a text of Scylax and from certain medals on which its name appears in Phœnician characters. Near the Phœnician settlement, but separated from it by the river, the indigenous tribes built a town which lived upon its relations with the stranger merchants.[1] The latter were strongly fortified on a lofty hill commanding the mouth of the Lixus, now the *Oued-Loukos*. The position was admirably chosen; the

FIG. 244.—The temple and ramparts of Eryx. From a coin.[2]

Phœnician ships could at all times find a secure refuge in the river's mouth, while the windings of the stream covered the town and made it difficult of access on the land side (Fig. 246).

Lixus was divided into two distinct parts; the Acropolis, standing upon the lofty plateau which forms the northern half of the hill, and the town proper, whose remains are to be traced on the slopes facing south and north-east. Besides this it seems that there was a suburb of considerable size on the river bank to the north of the town.

The greater part of the site is now covered with a dense growth

[1] . . . . καὶ πολις φοινίκων Λίξος, καὶ ἑτέρα πόλις Λιβύων ἐστὶ πέραν τοῦ ποτάμου.

[2] Enlarged from DONALDSON, *Architectura numismatica*, No. 32.

of myrtles, carob-trees, mastics and wild olives, which a perfect network of bramble and bindweed renders quite impenetrable at many points. M. Tissot, from whom we have taken the figures and other details we are about to give on the subject of Lixus, succeeded, however, in traversing the whole area in two different directions and in following the complete trace of the walls.[1]

The *enceinte* of the lower city was entirely built of small stones; it is identical in character with many other structures in the same region, and they date from the Roman period, as we know by the fragments of Latin epigraphy and sculpture imbedded in them. In the whole of this country the only strangers who preceded the Roman colonists and brought the germs of civilization to its

FIG. 245.—The wall of Motya. From Houel.

natives were the Phœnicians. To the Phœnicians, therefore, without a moment's hesitation, were the remains of a very different wall at the same place attributed. The difference between this and the rampart of the lower town is made all the more conspicuous by the way the latter has been repaired. Wherever a breach

[1] These ruins had already been pointed out under their right name by BARTH (*Wanderungen durch die Küstenländer des Mittelmeers*, pp. 21, 22); but we owe our only circumstantial description of them, with maps and views, to M. CHARLES TISSOT, formerly Minister Plenipotentiary of France in Morocco (*Recherches sur la géographie comparée de la Mauritanie Tingitane*, pp. 203-221; and *Mémoires présentés à l'Académie des Inscriptions par divers savants étrangers*, vol. ix. p. 139). The map we reproduce was perforce omitted from the Academy memoir.

occurs it is filled in with small stones, while the original work is entirely carried out in large blocks, like those we saw at Banias, Eryx, and Motya.

The rampart of the upper town incloses a hexagon of about 2,000 yards in total circumference. It is built of huge stones carefully dressed and set without mortar (Fig. 247). All the blocks in a single course are of the same height but of a different length; the majority measure about sixty inches by forty, but some of those at the angles are as much as twelve feet long by nearly seven high. At some points the wall is still from fourteen to eighteen feet high. The angles are strengthened by square towers.

The only building of which any important remains are still visible was, perhaps, a temple. It is built of huge stones, and the large rough slabs with which a sort of covered way is roofed remind us of the *Panaghia Phaneromeni* of Larnaca. We are led to see a temple in this building by the discovery in its immediate neighbourhood of a cone cut from a very hard stone which is not to be found in the country. In this we can hardly refuse to recognize a symbol of the same kind as that found at Gozo, in the Giganteia (Fig. 223).

These ruins lie between the Acropolis and a small artificial harbour, partly formed by a wall about seventy yards long. This harbour had two entrances, and by its means the Phœnician ships could be brought close up to the warehouses. While awaiting their turns they could anchor in the river.

All this helps us to form a good idea of what a Phœnician settlement among barbarous tribes was like. Life and movement had their centre about the harbour; a little higher up were the sanctuaries to which the sailors came to offer their vows to Melkart and Astarte. Finally, although they took care to be on good terms with the natives, it was necessary that their dwellings should be guarded from sudden attack. Wherever safety was not insured by the nature of the site, as it was at Motya and Gades, the factory was safe-guarded by one of those ramparts of solid masonry against which the efforts of a band of savages could do nothing. No doubt the Acropolis was provided with reservoirs of fresh water and silos filled with grain.

Nothing proves the energy of the Phœnician race more clearly than all these arrangements for enabling a few hundreds of

FIG. 246.—Plan of Lixus. From the data given by M. Charles Tissot.

merchants and sailors to live in safety so many hundreds of miles away from that native city which they enriched by their self-sacrifice.

If the Punic engineers were able to carry out such considerable works as these in Sicily, and on the distant shores of the Atlantic, it stands to reason that they would spare no pains to fortify the capital of the Empire. At a very early period Carthage became alive to the necessity of being on her guard against the jealousy of other Phœnician cities on the same coast, against the ill-will of her Libyan subjects, and against the feelings of envy and covetousness which her wealth and industrial success could not fail to excite. The ancients speak with wonder of the wall of Carthage, which must, after the suburb of Megara was included

FIG. 247.—The wall of Lixus. From an unpublished drawing by Charles Tissot.

in it, have been from six to seven leagues in total length (Fig. 248).[1] Every captain who ventured to attack the Cartha-

[1] OROSIUS says the *enceinte* of Carthage was 20 miles in circumference, EUTROPIUS says 22, LIVY 23 (*Epitome* of book li.). STRABO says 360 stades, or 72,810 yards (41 miles 650 yards), a figure we can hardly accept; there must be some mistake either by the author or his copyist. Upon the plan of Carthage drawn up by DAUX, in which all the remains of ancient walls are laid down with the greatest care, the total length of the wall, according to M. Tissot, is 28,300 mêtres (about 31,200 yards). Daux's plan will be published by M. Tissot in the great work he has in preparation upon Carthaginian and Roman Africa. [Since these words were written M. Tissot has died and left his great work incomplete. The first volume, however, is in print, and the manuscript of the rest in such a condition that its publication may be surely expected.—ED.] On the whole, it agrees with that of Falbe, the best

ginians in Africa—Agathocles, Regulus, the leaders of the revolted mercenaries—was checked at the foot of these walls; even at the end of the third Punic war, when Carthage no longer had an army, they offered a long resistance to the legions of Rome.



FIG. 248.—Map of the peninsula of Carthage.

We are told that the *enceinte* of Carthage was built of dressed stone, *saxo quadrato*.[1] According to Diodorus it was forty cubits,

we have so far (*Recherches sur l'emplacement de Carthage*, with five plates and a topographical plan; Paris, Imprimerie Royale, 1883). Our plan is taken from M. Duruy's *Histoire des Romains*, vol. i. p. 415.

[1] OROSIUS, iv. 22.

or sixty-one feet, high, and twenty two cubits, or thirty-four feet, thick.[1] Appian gives about the same thickness, but he reduces the height to thirty cubits, or about forty-six feet. He calls this the height of the curtain beneath the battlements, and says that the towers, which had four stories, were much higher.[2] He adds that the wall was triple at least on the side of Byrsa and the Gulf of Tunis.[3] The author of the best work on the question, the regretted Charles Graux, shows that although these dimensions are out of the common, there is nothing astonishing in them, and that the figures of Appian especially are admissible enough.[4]

What follows, however, is not so easily explained. According to Appian there were, at least on the west and south, three walls exactly like each other, and separated by regular distances. In the interior of each there were stables for 300 elephants, and, over them, for 4,000 horses, as well as lodging for 24,000 men, and huge magazines containing food for the elephants and forage for the horses.

There are many things in the description of Appian that try our credulity and make us regret the loss of the account left by Polybius, an accurate writer, who was, morever, an eye witness of the great siege. For a right interpretation of Appian's text we cannot do better than turn to the incisive study of Charles Graux, who has no difficulty in showing that the historian in question was nothing more than a compiler, of mediocre skill, and that, being quite ignorant of military matters, he formed an idea of the Carthaginian fortifications which does not bear analysis. Graux gives a very clear explanation of the triple wall. To this end he makes use of the rules laid down by Philo the engineer in his *Manual of Fortification; of the Attack and Defence of Places*, a work compiled, in the opinion of some scholars, in the third, according to others, in the second, century of our era.[5] He

[1] DIODORUS, XXXII. xiv.

[2] APPIAN, viii. 95. Τούτων (of the walls) δ' ἕκαστον ἦν ὕψος μὲν πηχῶν λ', χώρις ἐπάλξεών τε καὶ πύργων.

[3] There are some words missing from the text of his description; they may be restored with considerable certainty.

[4] CHARLES GRAUX, *Note sur les fortifications de Carthage*, pp. 192, 193, in the *Mélanges publiés par l'école des Hautes Etudes pour le dixième anniversaire de sa fondation* (8vo, Paris, 1878, pp. 175-208). For all questions of topography reference must be had to the dissertation of DUREAU DE LA MALLE, entitled *Recherches sur la topographie de Carthage*, with notes by M. DUGASTE: 1 vol. 8vo, 1835.

[5] This curious work is the only treatise on fortification left us by antiquity; the

compares the results so obtained with the inductions we may draw from the different episodes of the siege, and with the descriptions given by Daux of the ramparts of Thapsus and Adrumetum; these towns were closely related to Carthage, and they must have possessed lines of circumvallation differing from those of the parent city only in extent; they were built by the same architects and on the same plan. On this point the evidence of Daux is so exact and precise as to leave no room for doubt.[1]

Appian must have been mistaken when he says there were three similar lines of circumvallation. On no ancient site have any traces of such an arrangement been found, and the reason of their absence is not far to seek. The first circle once captured would afford a splendid vantage-ground from which to attack the second, and so on to the third. The great object in ancient sieges was to raise the batteries of the besiegers to at least the same level as the battlements of the wall attacked, and this result would follow at once from the capture of the first *enceinte;* after that the reduction of the second and third would be simple enough. So that a triple wall such as that described by Appian would add very little to the strength of a place.

The real meaning of the author, Polybius perhaps, upon whom Appian based himself, was very different. As we know from Philo, the custom in fortifying a city according to the full rules of the art was to dig three concentric ditches, each as wide and deep as circumstances would allow, and behind the first of these, that is, behind the ditch nearest to the town, to build the wall proper, with its towers and crenellations. Behind the second ditch the προτείχισμα, or *advanced-wall*, was built. This was much lower

text has only once been published, namely, in the *Veteres mathematici* (Paris, Imprimerie Royale, 1 vol. folio). It is generally known as *Philonis Byzantii liber quintus.* The text from which Graux gives so many quotations in his *Note sur les fortifications de Carthage* differs sensibly from the one published; Graux had a new edition of Philo in preparation, and had therefore collated the three extant manuscripts of his work. An able officer of engineers, M. Albert de Rochas d'Aiglun, published a translation of it in 1872 under the title: *Poliorcétique des Grecs. Traité de fortification, d'attaque et de défense des places, par Philon de Byzance, traduit pour la première fois du Grec en Français, commenté et accompagné de fragments explicatifs tirés des ingenieurs et historiens Grecs;* Paris, 8vo, 1872 (Tanera).

[1] A. Daux, *Recherches sur l'origine et l'emplacement des emporia phéniciens dans le Zeugis et le Byzacium* (1 vol. 8vo, 1869), p. 278.



FIG. 249.—The triple wall of Thapsus. From Daux.

than the main rampart, but it afforded a shelter to the catapults and other machines, and to the troops who served them. Finally, behind the third ditch, there was an outer defence of palisades, which served to at least prolong the siege and to put off for some days the moment when the main wall should be seriously attacked. Daux tells us that he found easily traceable remains of a triple *enceinte* like this both at Thapsus and Adrumetum. We give his restorations (Figs. 246 and 250). Thus there is perfect accord between the theories handed down to us by Philo and the evidence collected by examining the Punic ruins. Appian himself admits the distinction between the wall and the advanced-wall, if not in so many words, at least by implication.[1]

The idea of three exactly similar walls must, therefore, be given up; and the dimensions given by Diodorus and Appian must be taken as applying to only one of the three, the innermost one, which was the real bulwark of the city. When the historians of the siege spoke of the triple wall, it was merely to distinguish between the fortifications where they were complete, on the side towards the isthmus, and the mere skirt of masonry by which the town was embraced on the side towards the sea. So that we must not multiply by three the numbers given by Appian for elephants, horses, and foot-soldiers. We must be content with 300 elephants, 4,000 cavalry, and 20,000 infantry, all of whom could easily, according to Graux, have found accommodation in the casemates of a single wall, especially as it was not less than 7,000 yards long. The distance from the Lake of Tunis to the Lake of Soukhara, across the isthmus, is about 5,500 yards, and we must allow at least 1,500 for the windings of the rampart, for its salients and re-entering angles.

A detailed discussion of the topography of Carthage would here be out of place, but it is important that her fortifications should be clearly understood. Even when shorn of the magnitude ascribed to them by some writers, they still remain perhaps the most

[1] APPIAN, viii. 97. He speaks of the προτείχισμα at the end of this paragraph, and in an earlier passage we should no doubt read προτείχισμα instead of the ἐπιτείχισμα of the manuscripts. Graux's correction to that effect seems beyond dispute; the word ἐπιτείχισμα has quite a different meaning. No other word but προτείχισμα could be rightly opposed to τὰ ὑψηλὰ τείχη, "the elevated wall," which Censorinus wished to attack after having filled up the ditch and beaten down the rampart low enough.

important work of Phœnician engineers. And they were imposing by their workmanship as well as their mass; their masonry has a regularity that we find in no other work of the same race. Of this we may judge from the section of the walls of Byrsa uncovered by Beulé (Fig. 47). He was mistaken in thinking this fragment belonged to the great wall; it formed part of the defences of the citadel, but we have no reason to believe that the wall of the Acropolis and the great rampart in the plain were not built in the same fashion.

As at Eryx, the stones are set without mortar, and the horizontality of the courses is carefully preserved. But more care has been taken over the face of the structure; most of the stones are of exactly the right height for the course in which they are placed, but there are some which encroach upon those above and below, and, being held by tenon and mortise, add greatly to the solidity of the work. None of those hollows filled in with small stones which we encountered at Eryx are to be seen here. Joints are almost always so placed as to stand upon the centre of the blocks below them. The perfection of the finest Greek masonry is not reached, but looked at from a little distance the whole has much the appearance of a Greek structure, and we are driven to ask whether the masons who built the enceinte of Carthage, or at least that part which has been recovered, may not have found their models in some of the buildings on the neighbouring island of Sicily. The walls of Carthage were often repaired,[1] and we have no reason to suppose that the fragment laid bare by Beulé dates from a very remote epoch or belongs to the primitive defences of the town; most likely it was built about the time of Regulus or Agathocles, in the fourth or third century before our era.

The following is Beulé's description of the foundations he discovered to the south of Byrsa, about sixty feet below the present surface of the ground, and beneath a thick layer of ashes, which show how terrible was the conflagration in which Carthage disappeared. "Imagine a wall thirty-three feet seven inches thick, built entirely of large blocks of tufa; not massive, but containing chambers as shown in the annexed figure (Fig. 251). Standing outside Byrsa one looks upon the wall which faced the enemy; it is six feet eight inches thick. Behind it runs a corridor six feet four inches wide; from this open a number of apse-ended

[1] Livy, xxx. ix.



FIG. 250.—The great wall at Thapsus. From Daux.

chambers separated from the corridor by walls three feet four inches thick . . . . they are backed against the hill of Byrsa and their end walls are three feet four inches thick at their thinnest parts. The chambers themselves are fourteen feet deep and twelve feet eight inches wide; they are separated from one another by walls three feet eight inches thick. These chambers form a continuous series and their small size allows the wall to remain practically as strong as if they did not exist."[1]

These last words contain a mistake which has already been pointed out.[2] A wall little more than six feet thick would oppose but a slender resistance to a great ram put in motion by thousands of vigorous arms. It is likely that the section of the wall found intact by Beulé represents not the first of the two stories of chambers indicated by Appian,[3] but the very foundations, the substructures of the rampart. Sunk into soft rock which supported



FIG. 251.—Plan of the wall of Byrsa. Carthage. From Beulé.

them on two faces, they must have escaped the destruction which overtook the rest of the building. The upper part of the wall must have been solid or nearly so for the whole of its thirty feet of thickness if it was to resist the ram. The chambers must have been in the upper part of the structure, and beyond the reach of that murderous engine. At Thapsus Daux found that above the ground the wall had a solid thickness of twenty-one feet four inches; and Thapsus was only a town of the second class, so that we should find nothing to surprise us in an excess of one-third in all the measurements of the Carthaginian ramparts.

Beulé thought the vaulted chambers above mentioned (Fig. 251)

[1] BEULÉ, *Fouilles à Carthage*, pp. 59, 60.

[2] DAUX, *Recherches sur les origines et l'emplacement des emporia phéniciens*, pp. 194-196.

[3] APPIAN, viii. 98.

were store-rooms; elephants and horses would not, he says, be lodged on the abrupt slopes of the acropolis. But perhaps the most probable explanation of chambers like these, lying upon the rock and all communicating with each other, is to suppose that they were cisterns or reservoirs.[1] It would be easy to keep them always full, for the catching surface at command was great, and nothing but a good system of pipes and channels was required for its proper utilisation. Such a precaution seems to have been universal in Punic fortifications; this same arrangement has been found at Adrumetum, at Utica, at Thapsus, and at Thysdrus. In this respect foresight was carried so far that even the second line of defence, standing some forty to fifty yards in front of the great rampart, was supplied with similar chambers (Fig. 249). The mercenaries who formed the garrison thus had their own supply of water beneath their feet and did not need to encroach upon the resources of the townsfolk.

From all these facts and considerations we may gather the following general idea as to the constitution of the great rampart of Carthage. Above the cisterns hidden in its foundations the wall must have been practically solid for a considerable height, that is to say, up to above the highest point to which a battering-ram could reach. There was nothing, however, to forbid the erection of stables for horses and elephants immediately behind the rampart. Above the solid part of the wall there were chambers, either vaulted or ceiled with timber, in which soldiers could be lodged and war material stored. There may have been one or two rows, or one or two stories of these chambers, as Appian tells us, and their arrangement may have varied in order to fit the trace of the wall. Their front walls must have been very thick, and pierced with loopholes. Above them ran the barbette. At regular distances of two plethra, or 206½ feet, rose the square towers with which the wall was flanked.[2] Being higher than the curtain by two stories they enabled the defenders to pour missiles on the flank of an assailant even after he had reached the summit of the wall, while they afforded a post of vantage for artillery.[3]

[1] DAUX, *Recherches*, pp. 190-192. On this point GRAUX is of the same opinion as Daux. *Note*, p. 196.

[2] It is from APPIAN (viii. 95) that we get this distance of two plethra for the intervals between the towers; he also tells us that the towers were four stories high.

[3] DAUX, *Recherches*, pp. 193, 194.

The width and depth of the upper chambers were quite independent of the size of the subterranean cisterns, because the two were separated by a huge mass of solid masonry. Any restoration of the upper part of the rampart can hardly be more than conjecture, and it is therefore as a sort of graphic hypothesis, if we may be allowed the phrase, that we have reproduced the principal wall of Thapsus as restored by Daux (Fig. 240). Some of its details may be open to dispute, but on the whole it is not without probability.

Here we must bring this study of Phœnician defences to an end. Perhaps it is already too long, but we were tempted to discuss the question in some detail because we thought the principles of the Greeks as laid down by Philo were to be traced in the plan of the ramparts of Carthage. On the other hand the Carthaginian masonry, as we see it at Byrsa, is connected with the much earlier system in use at Arvad and Sidon by the intermediate stage illustrated by those walls of Eryx on which the Phœnician mason's marks may still be traced. And who knows but that the Tyrian and Carthaginian engineers contributed much by their example towards the preparation of those rules and formulæ which the Greek theorists drew up under the successors of Alexander? The ramparts of Tyre have disappeared even more completely than those of Carthage, but is it possible they could have offered so long and stubborn a resistance to the Macedonian attack had they been otherwise than admirably designed and amply provided with military engines? During the whole duration of the famous siege the Tyrian artillery held its own with that of Alexander. Tyre fell not because her defenders were less skilled or less inventive than her assailants, but because Alexander was gifted with a boldness of imagination and a prodigious energy which did not hesitate to attack nature herself. At Tyre, as on all the battle-fields of Europe and Asia on which Greece was then a combatant, she triumphed through the impetuous genius of the young hero—I had nearly said the young god—by whom she was led. And science carried on the work begun by arms. The Greek language soon became a kind of universal tongue; understood almost to the Indus, it allowed many active spirits to set about the inventory of the Greek inheritance; the traditions of that old eastern world whose course seemed to be over were gathered up; every technical formula or receipt, all the secret

processes elaborated during centuries of unceasing work, were registered for the benefit of the new power. A rich and industrious community like that of the Phœnicians must have counted for much in such an inventory. Their wealthy cities had such treasures to guard that they must have spared no time or trouble in supplementing their military weakness in the field by the strength of their ramparts and the efficiency of their artillery. The Greeks were the first to compile treatises on the subject, treatises which did not become obsolete till the invention of gunpowder, but no doubt they owed more than one idea and useful suggestion to the men who built the ramparts of Sidon, Tyre, and Carthage.

§ 2.—*Towns and Hydraulic Works.*

The remains of Phœnician towns are even slighter than those of their defences. Here and there a rocky site bears traces of the buildings for which it once supplied a foundation (Figs. 37 and 38), some of them having been partly cut from its mass. Such buildings, however, only stood on the outskirts or suburbs of cities. Within the ramparts the population was so closely packed that houses had to be carried to a great height; at Tyre, Strabo tells us, they were higher than at Rome, and those of Arvad were no less lofty.[1] In one district at least of Carthage, along those three great streets of the commercial quarter which led from the bazaar up to Byrsa, the closely packed houses were six stories high;[2] they had flat roofs and the streets were narrow.[3] With a climate like that of Syria and North Africa wide streets would have been a waste of space. To get some idea of the internal appearance of one of these Phœnician cities it is enough to have penetrated into the old parts of Naples and Genoa, or, without going so far, to have visited the old Breton city of St. Malo, which in the close embrace of its walls has been compelled to turn every foot of soil to good account, and to push its roofs so near the sky

[1] STRABO, xvi. ii. 23 and 13.

[2] APPIAN, viii. 128.

[3] This we gather from Appian's narrative. He speaks of the combats which went on on the roofs when the Romans attacked this quarter, and of the bridges they threw across from one block to another as they gradually made their way.

that from its upper stories a wide sea view can everywhere be obtained in spite of the surrounding ramparts.

But even at the height of its prosperity, St. Malo was hardly more than a sailor's town, while the great Phœnician cities had more strings to their bow than navigation and its profits; they were great manufacturing centres; they deserved to be compared to our great industrial cities, such as Birmingham, Leeds, Elbeuf, or Roubaix. In some quarters at least the air was full of the sounds and the scent of factories. "At Tyre," says Strabo, "all the most favourable conditions for dyeing were united; and it must be allowed that although they added so much to the wealth of the place the presence of so many dyeworks took away from its advantages as a place of residence." [1]

A whole quarter of the city was occupied by industrials, but there was another, the highest and most open no doubt, where the dwellings of the rich merchants who sent a fleet to sea as each spring came round, were grouped. Such men as these would require houses whose external aspect should announce the wealth of their owner to every passer by. The houses of Tyre, of Sidon, and of other Phœnician cities were admired by the ancients and taken as standards and points of comparison.[2] And the rich men of whom we speak would not be satisfied with their town houses, which must have been cramped for room like every other building within the walls.[3] It was in the suburbs, outside the walls, that they had their favourite dwellings, the homes in which they enjoyed their wealth and the repose it gave. The people of Arvad and Tyre crossed the narrow straits dividing their cities from the mainland; those of Sidon and Berytus had only to spread themselves over the fine forests and flowery plains to get all they wanted. There they had the villas and small farms, the sites of which can be divined by the modern explorer from the traces they have left in the soil.[4] It was in these plains that those agricultural

[1] STRABO, xvi. ii. 23.

[2] JOSEPHUS, *De Bello Judaico*, ii. xviii. 9. Seven hundred years before Ezekiel had already said of Tyre: "Thy builders have perfected thy beauty" (xxxviii. 4), and again "They shall break down thy walls and destroy thy pleasant houses" (xxvi. 12).

[3] See MENANDER, quoted by Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* viii. v. 3. The historian says of Hiram: οὗτος ἔχωσε τὸ εὐρύχωρον. Another historian of Tyre, Dios, refers to the same works and also to those by which a small islet with a temple was added to the principal island (JOSEPHUS, *Ibid.*).

[4] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 633-635, 638, 639, 644, 668, 669, &c.

traditions were born which were afterwards perfected by the Phœnicians of Africa and finally embodied by Mago, the Carthaginian captain, in a book which the Roman Senate caused to be translated into Latin.[1]

Before these Syrian plains would yield plentiful crops they had to be well watered, and the crowded urban population required their supply of the same element. Accustomed as they were to rock cutting, the Phœnicians would have no difficulty in making conduits to carry the torrents of the Lebanon on to and across the plain. But of all the hydraulic works in Syria which date from the Phœnician period the most curious is the well of *Ras-el-Ain*, "The head of the springs." About four miles south of Tyre and a few hundred yards from the sea several springs rise with great force within thick-walled octagonal towers, which are eighteen to twenty feet high. There are four of these fountains. The most abundant is ninety-three feet deep. "They are true artesian wells, fed by the rains and snows of the Lebanon. The arrangement of the cretaceous strata in the neighbouring mountains leaves no doubt upon the point. The basins are natural openings through which the water is forcibly driven by strong pressure from below."[2]

Is it to the Romans or to the Phœnicians that the credit of having regulated the openings, of having built those solid sheaths of masonry by which the water is driven to a convenient height above the plain, is due? We are inclined to believe that the Phœnicians were the first to think of the contrivance, which is as effective as it is simple.[3] These are the only springs in the whole neighbourhood of Tyre, and so long as the water was not constrained to mount in a tube it must have been lost, as it is now, in

[1] COLUMELLA, I. i. 13.

[2] LORTET, *La Syrie d'aujourd'hui*, p. 128.

[3] The following passage from STRABO shows that the Phœnicians had grasped the physical law by virtue of which the water rises in the artesian well. "In war time they obtain water a little in front of the city, from the channel (between the island and the mainland), in which there is an abundant spring. The water is obtained by letting down from a boat, which serves for the purpose, and inverting over the spring (at the bottom of the sea), a wide-mouthed funnel of lead, the end of which is contracted to a moderate sized opening; round this is fastened a leathern pipe which we may call the neck, which receives the water forced up from the spring through the funnel. The water first forced up is sea-water, but the boatmen wait for the flow of pure and potable water, which is received into vessels ready for the purpose, in as large a quantity as may be required, and carry it into the city."

the neighbouring sea. But we know that the whole of the district was inhabited by a dense population and that it was highly cultivated;[1] we may therefore conclude that the Phœnicians did not fail to discover how to utilise the springs to the best advantage, and the only way was to make use of the principle to which we have alluded. The walls must have been repaired and restored more than once, and parts may be pointed out which bear signs of a Roman hand,[2] but in the canal which runs from the springs along the foot of the hill and in the direction of Tyre, Gaillardot, an excellent judge, recognizes a system of masonry which has nothing either Greek or Roman about it. "Wherever the conduit is still covered it presents, almost without exception, bare walls formed partly by the rock itself, partly by huge stones fixed without a trace of cement."[3]

To the Romans, of course, belongs the aqueduct carried on arches from the Tell-el-Machouk, opposite Tyre, across the isthmus of Alexander, so as to bring the water of the *Ras-el-Ain* to the city itself. When this aqueduct was built the walls about the springs were perhaps heightened and the conduit repaired. But this very enterprise was no doubt suggested by the skill shown by the ancient Tyrians in compelling the column of water to mount to a convenient height. Before this great work was carried out Tyre depended for much of her consumption upon watering places on the neighbouring coast. An Egyptian traveller who visited Tyre about the end of the reign of Rameses II., says with surprise, "They carry water there in boats."[4] A conduit must have brought the waters of the *Ras-el-Ain* down to reservoirs constructed on the sea-shore, opposite the island, whence it was carried in skins to the city. But Tyre was too often menaced by her enemies to trust entirely to such a supply as this. Every house, like the houses of modern Syria, was provided with a cistern; this is proved by the simple fact, which we know on the authority of a Phœnician writer, that for five years maritime Tyre was able to do without a supply from *terra firma*.[5] Shalmaneser, who was

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 577, 579, 582, and 634. [2] *Ibid.* p. 593.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 594. Conf. p. 582.

[4] *Papyrus Anastasi*, i. pl. xxi. l. 1, 2. Conf. CHABAS, *Le Voyage d'un Egyptien*, pp. 165-171 (Chalons, 1866).

[5] Menander makes a clear distinction between the ποταμός (the Leontes which flows into the sea north of Tyre) and the ὑδραγωγίαι (the wells of *Ras-el-Ain* and the

unable to attack the city for the want of ships, placed a guard at the mouth of the Leontes and at the springs of *Ras-el-Ain*. At Arvad there were cisterns cut in the rock which are still in use.[1]

In order to catch all the rain-water they could it is probable that the Phœnicians paved their streets, squares, and courtyards with large stone slabs; we know that the Carthaginians did so. The aqueduct through which water flowed to the city from Mount Zaghouan, a work which has been lately re-established, dates only from the Roman epoch. The real Carthage, the great queen of the Mediterranean, drank nothing but rain-water, and in order that the autumn deluges and the rare showers of the other seasons should be gathered to the last drop, every surface had to be brought into requisition. The houses had flat roofs covered with concrete, whence the water poured down into hidden reservoirs. There were public cisterns in the lower parts of the town for the rain-water from the streets. The Carthaginians had the credit in antiquity of being the inventors of street paving.[2] When the soil is removed to any depth, these slabs are found still in place under the thick layer of ashes which represents the city of Hannibal. Under the slabs there are drains carefully laid, with their mouths under the edges of the foot-paths.[3] The visitor to modern Tunis as he sinks in the mud or dust of the unpaved streets must often wish that the degenerate heir of Carthage was more worthy of its ancestor in this matter of street engineering.

At Malka, north of Byrsa, to the south-east of this citadel and near the harbour, considerable remains of the ancient reservoirs may be traced; and it is difficult to discriminate in these ruins between what belongs to Roman and what to Punic Carthage. No doubt when the town was restored by her Roman Emperors and became once more a great and populous city, the remains of the ancient works must have been utilised for new reservoirs, but

conduits which ran from it). His curious account of the blockade is quoted by JOSEPHUS (*Ant. Jud.*, ix. xiv. 2).

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 40.

[2] SERVIUS, *Ad Æneidem*, i. 422; ISIDORE, *Origines*, xv. xvi. 6; "Primi Pœni dicuntur lapidibus vias stravisse." We are tempted to believe, with Servius, that Virgil was alluding to these paved streets of Carthage in the passage where he describes the astonishment of Æneas at his first sight of the town built by Dido:

Miratur portas, strepitumque et strata viarum.

[3] Excavations of M. Gouvet, a French engineer in the service of the bey of Tunis. DAUX, *Recherches sur les emporia phéniciens*, p. 55.

the task must have been carried out by the methods familiar to the Roman engineers. Daux thus describes what are called the "small cisterns," those near the sea (Fig. 252) : "The reservoirs of Carthage were peculiar in their arrangement ; at the four angles of their vast parallelogram and in the centre were distributed six circular filters covered by as many domes or cupolas, which by their graceful lines varied the monotony of the barrel vaults which covered two rows of long parallel basins." Before ascribing these



Fig. 252.—Reservoirs of Carthage. From Davis.[1]

cisterns to the Carthaginians we must stop for a moment to inquire whether arches were built in Africa before the time of the Roman Conquest.

In order to solve this question we must divide it, and inquire, first, whether there is any reason to suppose that the Phœnicians were ignorant of the arch. It is difficult to believe they were unacquainted with its principle. They must often have seen

[1] *Carthage and Her Remains*, p. 392.

arches both in Egypt and Assyria, and we know their minds were continually open to the reception of new ideas and impressions from those neighbouring countries in which they passed so much of their time. Moreover, we have at least two examples of a Phœnician vault: in the tomb of Esmounazar we found in place some of the voussoirs of an arch which can only be attributed to the same period as the sarcophagus which lay beneath it (Fig. 112), and in a neighbouring tomb-chamber Gaillardot encountered the same arrangement.[1] That we are able to point only to these two examples in the country between Arvad and Tyre is perhaps a matter of chance; a new exploration may give to-morrow what we seek in vain to-day; but on the whole there is reason to believe that in Syria itself the Phœnicians only made a very restricted use of the arch, at least in their monumental work. We must remember that their architecture was based on forms derived from rock cutting, and that it was accustomed to huge units, so that its traditions were to some extent opposed to the arch It is to the necessity for covering voids with small stones that the employment of the arch may as a rule be traced. Moreover, when a vault has to be built of stone an amount of careful calculation and elaborate dressing has to be gone through, which was foreign to the ideas of the workmen of Arvad and Gebal.

Supposing, however, that the Phœnicians were not quite ignorant of the special advantages of the arch, they may well have been driven to make more frequent use of it in their western colonies. In the first place, a change of surroundings and of materials brings with it a corresponding change in methods, even when the latter are deeply engrained in the habits of a people. And the arch played a very important part in the architecture of those Etruscans and Latins with whom first the Syrians, and after them the Carthaginians, had so much to do. Kept together by the necessity for resisting the enterprises of the Phocæans, the Etruscans and Carthaginians lived, as a rule, in great amicability one with the other, and it was not until after many centuries of friendly commercial relations that Rome and Carthage engaged in the long and sanguinary duel which we know as the Punic wars. During those centuries many African merchants must have visited the shores of the Tiber; they must have seen the vaulted drains

[1] Renan, *Mission*, pp. 437 and 442.

which carried off the superfluous waters of the marshes, and the majestic arches which afforded a passage through the walls of fortified towns. Perhaps it was from the gateways of Latin and Etruscan cities that the idea of the posterns at Eryx was taken (Figs. 232 and 233). But here the arch is only apparent; its curves are not turned by voussoirs, they are cut in the mass of the horizontal courses. All those who have studied the ruins in Tunisia agree in ascribing to Rome the keyed arches which are found at many points of the old African province, and yet from Beulé's description—which, by the way, is much too summary—of the chambers in the foundations of the Byrsa wall, it would appear that they were roofed with surbased spherical vaults.[1]

We may then admit, until proof to the contrary, that the Carthaginians either did not use the keyed-masonry arch at all or used it very little; but we are told by one of the most careful students of their architecture, that they obtained a similar result with the use of arches turned in a kind of concrete, "small stones set in a bath of mortar mixed with sand so fine that its grains are hardly to be distinguished, and with lime made from the same material as the small stones. To this mixture lime has given a consistence and homogeneity equal, and not seldom even superior, to that of the stone employed."[2]

Many things lend probability to this hypothesis. At Carthage the building stone available was of very mediocre quality. It was a calcareous tufa, which rapidly lost consistency under exposure to the weather. Its durability was enhanced by covering those faces of any building which were turned towards the sea with a coat of tar.[3] Such a proceeding must have been rather costly, and the desire to avoid the expense must have caused concrete of one kind or another to come into very wide use. The Carthaginians made use of *pisé*. In the first century of our era the remains of edifices in beaten earth, viz., ramparts and guard-houses, were to be seen both in Spain and Africa.[4] These the Romans did not recognize

[1] BEULÉ, *Fouilles à Carthage*, p. 59. [2] DAUX, *Recherches*, p. 117.

[3] PLINY, *Hist. Nat.* xxvi. 48.

[4] The passage in PLINY on which we found this statement is interesting enough to deserve quotation: "Quid? Non in Africa Hispaniaque ex terra parietes, quos appellant formaceos, quoniam in forma circumdatis utrinque duabus tabulis inferciuntur verius quam instruuntur ævis durant, incorrupti imbribus, ventis, ignibus, omnique cæmento firmiores? Spectat etiamnunc speculas Hannibalis Hispania; terrenasque turres jugis montium impositas."—*Hist. Nat.* xxxv. 47.

as their own work, and the only builders who preceded them in the countries in question were the Phœnicians. The popular tradition was the right one. In Spain the name of Hannibal was attached to some of these erections, in which the people saw posts of observation (*speculæ*) raised by the famous captain on the summits of the hills.

The evidence of Pliny is very precise; there is only room for doubt on one point. Can we believe that buildings which had outlasted the centuries were of earth shaped in a mould? Must they not rather have been of concrete, or rubble, that is to say of a material in which a cement of lime and sand were the chief constituents? It is certain that even on the Syrian coast the Phœnicians made use of cement to hold together the embankments with which they increased the narrow sites of their towns. At Tyre especially banks were raised, which, we are told, resemble the mole of Algiers in hardness.[1] In Africa MM. Daux and Tissot ascribe to the same epoch the rubble vaults in the fortress of Bulla Regia, in the valley of the Bagrada, and the military fort at Utica;[2] but this attribution may be, and, as a fact, it has been, contested. A recent discovery, however, has brought to light a structure in which this method of building is combined with signs of a Phœnician origin which cannot be disputed. In the report of Captain Vincent addressed to the *Académie des Inscriptions* on the 26th September, 1883,[3] we read: "Upon the mamelon known as *Bon-amba*, situated at a distance of about 2,000 yards from the town of Béja, a mass of red concrete crops up here and there through the soil. It is very hard, and full of large blocks of stone; it extends for a considerable distance right and left of the *Place d'Armes*. In March, 1883, some workmen were digging a channel to carry off the rain-water, when they brought to light a vaulted chamber with some human bones, a lamp and a funerary urn in it."

This discovery gave the hint, and more excavations were undertaken, with the result that a hundred and twenty tombs were

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, p. 560.

[2] CH. TISSOT, *Le Bassin du Bagrada et la voie romaine de Carthage à Hippone par Bulla Regia*, p. 37 (*Mémoires présentés par divers savants à l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1881, 4to); DAUX, *Recherches sur les emporia phéniciens, Étude sur la ville d'Utique et ses environs.*

[3] The report is dated from *Badja*, a small town situated to the west of Tunis, on the site of the ancient Vaja, where Captain Vincent commanded a small French garrison.

found and opened. So far as we can judge by the figures in the report there is little variety in their form, which is roughly that of a boot. The chamber is reached by a rectangular well, whose walls are built of large stones. The well is from twenty to thirty inches square at the mouth, and from five to ten feet deep. At its lower extremity it becomes lost in the chamber to which it gives access. The chamber itself, "hollowed out of the concrete-like masonry," resembles a kind of pocket, and has the longitudinal section, as a rule, of a surbased spherical vault. These chambers are more rough, irregular, and insignificant, whether we look at their dimensions, the quality of their workmanship, or the objects found in them, than any of the sepulchral groups found in Syria, Cyprus, or Sardinia. The chambers are all small, and the pots they contain very common, but this humble provincial graveyard is interesting because its date can be fixed, both by what we do and what we do not find in it. There is not one of those Latin inscriptions which abound in all the cemeteries of Roman Africa; this by itself is enough to suggest that these tombs were built before the country was made into a Roman province. And everything confirms this first impression. The arrangement of the graves is characteristic of Phœnicia; we find a well giving access to a chamber in which the corpse is stretched upon the ground. It may be objected that this method of entombment may have remained in fashion with the Liby-Phœnicians even after the fall of Carthage. But we have evidence that these graves must have been built before that catastrophe, or at least not much later than the year 146, in the fact that a certain number of bronze coins were found in them, and that all those coins were Punic, with the well-known types of the horse and the palm-tree (Fig. 253).[1] After the middle of the second century these pieces were no longer struck, and the bronze money of Punic Carthage can hardly have continued in circulation long after that date. From

[1] "Several copper medals were found; they were sometimes a horse's head, sometimes a galloping horse. On their face we find the originals of the facsimile given in the *Univers pittoresque*, edition of 1844, article on Carthage by Dureau de la Malle (plate vii. fig. 2, and plate viii. figs. 1 and 9)."—Reports of Captain VINCENT. The coin reproduced on p. 374 from DURUY'S *Histoire des Romaines* (vol. i. p. 142) is not one of those found in the graves at Badja, but it shows the same types. It is of silver, and was most likely struck in Sicily. Obv., the forepart of a horse crowned by victory, an ear of barley, and seven Punic letters read by M. de Saulcy as Kart-hadast (Carthage); rev., a palm-tree and four Punic letters, *Maknat*, the camp.

all this it follows that the little cemetery dates from the period of Carthaginian independence, and that before the Romans were established in Africa their great rivals understood how to employ concrete on a large scale; so that we are free to believe that they made use of it to build such things as the domes of their reservoirs and the vaulted chambers of the admiralty at Utica.

Whatever may be the date of the walls and vaults which lie open to the modern traveller in the great cisterns of Carthage, we may be sure that the plan on which they are built dates from a very early period in the history of African Phœnicia. In Carhage, as in many more of these African towns, the reservoirs were divided into two series, which could be separated or allowed to communicate at the will of their managers. The rain-water inevitably brought with it a considerable deposit of sand and earth, so that by directing it into alternate basins one could be cleaned



Fig. 253.—Carthaginian coin.

while the next was in use. By examining some rural structures of the kind we shall see how this mechanism was worked.

The foresight which provided the large towns with plentiful supplies of fresh water did not rest there; it performed the same service for those rural districts in which agricultural operations and the rearing of great herds of cattle and horses could not be carried on without a steady provision of water. From one end of Tunis to the other the ruins of vast isolated reservoirs are encountered. Those near towns are repetitions in small of the urban reservoirs; but in the more distant cantons we find cisterns open to the sky; as a rule these are in pairs, the one tangent to the other. The best preserved of them all is on the road from Adrumetum to Aquæ Regiæ; our Fig. 254 gives a good idea of its arrangement.

These two basins stand in the lowest part of the plain; the diameter of the larger varies from forty to about sixty-seven feet. They may be compared to a pair of huge tuns in masonry. Their



FIG. 254.— Rural cistern. From Daux.

walls do not describe a circle but a regular polygon, whose visible part rises from twenty-three to twenty-seven feet above the ground. The contiguous reservoir is smaller ; its diameter is not more than from twenty-four to twenty-eight feet, but it is rather deeper than the other. At the point of junction there is a perpendicular slit, about sixteen inches wide, which descends almost to the floor, and allows the water to flow from one cistern into the other.

At the ground level a number of openings allowed the rain to pour into the larger reservoir, where they deposited the earth, sand, leaves, and other matters held in suspension. After the rains were over the sluice was opened and the water allowed to flow gently into the smaller reservoir, the whole thus acting as a



FIG. 255.—Plan of cistern. From Daux.

huge filter. The sluice was then reclosed and the water carried in leather buckets to the thirsty cattle.

The weight of water inclosed in these basins exerted a very strong thrust against their walls, and, warned no doubt by the destruction of those first erected, the builders took precautions against accident which seem to have been effectual in spite of their *naïveté*. At the points where the short stretches of straight wall joined each other, strong buttresses were erected, both within and without. To give our readers a clear idea of how this contrivance was arranged we here insert a plan of the large basin (Fig. 255), a cross section of the wall (Fig. 256), and an elevation of part of its

external face (Fig. 257). In the latter figure the reader will notice an ornamental detail. The wall is decorated at about half its height with a moulding or string-course, which is turned in a semi-circle over the head of the buttress. Its section is that of a torus, the one ornamental motive which is hardly ever absent from any structure to which a Phœnician origin can be surely assigned.

All these annular reservoirs are built of concrete. The one we have just described presents, moreover, one curious peculiarity; it affords a rare example of pure Phœnician workmanship still existing side by side with Roman construction. During the Roman period a large square filter was added to the larger basin, and covered with a flat roof over a vault (Fig. 254). This addition is built of rough stones arranged in regular courses; its angles are of dressed stone and the roof is a regular keyed vault.



FIG. 256.—Cross section of cistern wall. From Daux.



FIG. 257.—Elevation of part of cistern wall. From Daux.

The floor of the chamber is lower than that of the principal basin, and the roof is higher than the summit of its wall. There is an opening for ventilation in each of the four sides.

The advantages gained by this addition are obvious. The water was protected from the sun, from dust, and from those sand-laden blasts which are so common in this part of the world. The way in which the water was admitted from the great basin into this square filter was also an improvement upon that already described. At the point of junction the wall was pierced by several circular holes at vertical intervals of about twenty inches. These holes were plugged during the rains, while the turbid water was flowing into the great reservoir. Such a system allowed the flow of water into the square receiver to be regulated and did away with

all risk of muddiness from the sediment with which even its comparatively clean floor must have been covered.

We see then that in this building there were two clearly defined systems of construction. In the one there were regular courses of rough stone combined with angles of dressed masonry, and a keyed vault; in the other there was only a mass of concrete; walls, buttresses, even mouldings, all are of that substance. Neither parts of the work can belong to the modern civilisation of the country. It is many a long century since either the Moors or the Arabs gave a thought to such an enterprise as this. They have not even taken the trouble to keep the town reservoirs in repair, so that it is in the last degree unlikely that they would build such cisterns as these in the open country. Wherever they have taken it into their heads to contrive some reserve of the refreshing element they have been content with what are called in Tunis *feskias*, a sort of pond surrounded by a wall, in which the water is made fetid and unhealthy by the accumulated mud. We may therefore ascribe both parts of the reservoir to the ancient civilisation; the two circular basins to the Carthaginians, the square filter to their conquerors. The whole contrivance gives striking evidence of that genius for adapting means to ends which distinguished the Phœnician race.

At Malta, where springs are few and scanty, there are some fine antique cisterns, some of which may well date from the Phœnician epoch. We should be willing to recognize oriental hands in the well-preserved structure known as the *Gar-el-giganti*, near the harbour of Marsa Scirocco and the Bordj-en-Nadur, in which Maltese scholars see the ruins of a temple to Melkart. It is built entirely of good masonry. The stone roof lies on long architraves of the same material, which are in turn supported by twelve piers built up of large stones. A wide flight of steps gives access to the reservoir, and the whole has an imposing look of strength and simplicity.[1]

We should have liked much to know how those dwellings of the great Phœnician merchants and manufacturers, in which all the luxury of the ancient world was accumulated, were arranged and furnished; but details are wanting. It was once believed that

[1] CARUANA, *Report*, p. 19. We have been compelled to refrain from reproducing Mr. Caruana's illustration of this reservoir, because it contains certain incomprehensible details for which we should have had to find a conjectural explanation.

some remains of Cyclopean masonry at Oum-el-Awamid had belonged to Phœnician houses,[1] but after the remarks offered on the question by MM. Thobois and Renan it seems difficult to assign any date to these ruins. We can hardly avoid seeing in them the work of some population who, perhaps at some comparatively recent period, had settled upon an ancient site and appropriated the materials they found upon it to their own use.[2]

From such remains as these we can learn nothing about the lofty houses of Tyre and Carthage. The latter must have had porticoes, internal courtyards, and, on their upper stories, those open galleries which an Italian would call *loggie;* such arrangements would be demanded by the climate, and moreover we find them actually figured in some of the carved pictures of the Assyrians, the near neighbours of Eastern Phœnicia.[3] To build such galleries and even to endow them with a certain elegance, no costly



Fig. 258.—Base of column from a portico at Larnaca.

or stubborn materials were required. Timber alone was enough, or nearly enough. This we realise when we stand in some of the modern houses in these eastern towns and see arrangements which may well have been handed down through many a long century. Take, for instance, the following elements of a portico which occur in a house at Larnaca, in Cyprus. Stone is used only for the base of a wooden shaft (Fig. 258). The peculiar capital, of a design which makes it thoroughly well fitted for its work, is of wood. It supports an architrave, on which lie the ends of a number of round beams, their other extremities being engaged in the wall.

[1] De Saulcy, *Voyage à la Mer Morte*, vol. i. pp. 46, 47; De Vogüé, *Fragments d'un Voyage en Orient*, pp. 38, 41 *et seq.*

[2] Renan, *Mission*, pp. 704, 705, and plates l., lii., liv., and lv.

[3] *Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*, vol. i. fig. 76.

The row of small circles in which they terminate is not without its charm (Fig. 259).[1]



FIG. 259.—Detail of portico at Larnaca.

The houses of our day and the ancient dwellings of Phœnicia differ perhaps less in plan and their methods of construction,



FIG. 260.—Plan of ancient house at Malta. From Houel.

than in the choice of material and its arrangements. Where

[1] We take this sketch from a travelling album of M. Saladin's.

modern builders are content with hastily planed boards and pine trunk beams, their ancestors would have employed cypress and cedar, would have added a fine polish and perhaps ivory or metal ornaments. "Thy builders have perfected thy beauty," says Ezekiel in speaking of Tyre; "they have made all thy boards of fir-trees of Senir; they have taken cedars from Lebanon to make masts for thee. Of the oaks of Bashan have they made thine oars; the company of the Ashurites have made thy benches of ivory, brought out of the isles of Chittim." [1]



Fig. 261.—View of ancient house at Malta. From Houel.

In our examination of tombs and temples we have found the imitation of Egyptian types prevailing all over Phœnicia; the same tendency must have made itself felt in the arrangement and decoration of private dwellings. We find direct proof that it was so in the remains of a small building at Malta, in which a traveller of the last century, Houel, thought he had found the ruins of a Greek house. We give a plan and perspective of this curious fragment (Figs. 260 and 261). The best preserved thing about it is a square tower (*c*) carried on a base which is now almost entirely buried (*a*).

[1] Ezekiel, xxvii. 4-6.

It has a doorway (*e*), and a window about three feet from the ground (*a*). This tower is ten feet eight inches square, and eighteen feet ten inches high. Houel was an intelligent observer, and noticed the carefulness of the masonry and the singularity of the cornice, but he knew little of oriental art and never thought of the Phœnicians. Now, however, that we are better informed, we can read what these huge, cementless blocks tell us as to their own origin, and especially is all doubt removed by the aspect of the



FIG. 262.—The mausoleum at Thugga. From Bruce.

crowning ornament, which is neither more nor less than the familiar Egyptian cornice.

We do not think, however, that this structure dates from a very remote antiquity. The influence exercised by Egypt over Phœnician art was so profound that it must have survived to a very late period; we have seen it, in Syria, in the decoration of buildings which date only from the second century after Christ (Fig. 48).

Further examples of the same thing are to be met with in Africa. In Fig. 262 we reproduce a sketch, made by the famous traveller Bruce, from that mausoleum of Thugga from which a bi-lingual text, Libyan and Punic, was afterwards violently wrenched, to be carried to London. Here the Greek style is predominant in both details and general arrangement. This is natural enough, because from the style and lettering of the inscription we may date the building from the first century before our era; it is in fact, the tomb of some Numidian prince, erected in the years between the fall of Carthage and its restoration under the Empire. And yet, as Bruce instinctively perceived, there are signs of another tradition. He made separate drawings of the angle pilasters (Fig. 263) whose capitals are decorated with flowers recalling those on the lintel of

Fig. 263.—Angle pilaster.

Fig. 264.—Profile of cornice.

Ebba (Fig. 234), and also of a still more significant detail, namely, the Egyptian cornice with which the tomb is finished above (Fig. 264).[1] We again find this cornice in the well-known monument of the Numidian kings, the *Madracen*, which dates from the end of the second century before our era.[2]

[1] We borrow these sketches of Bruce from plate xxiv. in the work entitled *Travels in the footsteps of Bruce in Algeria and Tunis, illustrated by facsimiles of his original drawings*, by Lieut.-Col. R. L. Playfair; London, 4to, 1877.

[2] Archæologists are agreed in calling this the tomb of Massinissa or of Micipsa (De la Blanchère, *de rege Juba regis Jubæ filio*, Paris, 1883). A complete description of this monument, illustrated, is given by M. Brunon in the *Mémoires de la Société archéologique de Constantine*, 1873-74, pp. 304-353. A profile of the cornice is given on plate vii.

§ 3.—*Harbours.*

No inland Phœnician town is known to history. Of all the cities built by the Syrian merchants the harbour is the vital organ, the part that could not be injured or even threatened without grave damage to the body as a whole.

And yet Phœnicia was not, like Greece, a country pre-destined by nature to become a nursery for sailors and a school of navigation. The coast of Syria offers none of those thoroughly sheltered roads, or vast natural basins, which so abound on the coasts of Asia Minor and the Hellenic peninsula.

From the mouth of the Orontes to the river of Egypt there is no harbour to be for a moment compared to the Piræus, the Golden Horn, or the Gulf of Smyrna. The few capes are of too slight projection and too straight to do much in the way of providing a quiet anchorage. Few coasts are in fact more inhospitable, but all the early Phœnician mariners required was a shelter to take the wind out of their sails and allow them to be reefed, or a stretch of sand on which, at the worst, they could beach their flat-bottomed craft.

Wherever the coast did not rise in precipitous cliffs, creeks and sandy beaches were frequent enough, and in their choice of sites for their earliest settlements the Phœnicians appear to have always pitched upon points which were at once easily defensible and conspicuous from a distance. The islands and promontories upon which they built their houses were so many landmarks. Each had its peculiar physiognomy, and after a stormy night the captain of any ship at sea could tell at a glance whether he had Arad or Byblos, Tyre or Sidon, on his bow or quarter.

With the passage of time open fishing boats developed into decked ships, whose swelling sides were contrived to hold the precious merchandise which came and went between Phœnicia and the outer world. Basins had then to be provided in which vessels could lie quietly while being laden or discharged. Every accident of the land was made use of for the formation of real harbours; at some points, to the north of Sidon for instance, reefs which broke the waves as they rolled in upon the land were turned to

good account.[1] Such natural barriers were made more efficient by additions in concrete and masonry.[2] Artificial breakwaters were raised and the passages left through them so planned that they could be closed by chains.[3] Sidon had thus a *closed harbour*, as the ancients called it,[4] to the north, and to the south an anchorage protected to some extent by two jutting points of land between which ships could be drawn up on the beach when there was a heavy sea. This was the *Egyptian harbour*. It is now abandoned and the harbour on the north serves the little modern town. Tyre had two harbours, both closed ; the *Sidon harbour* to the north, the *Egyptian harbour* to the south. The latter has been entirely obliterated by the action of Alexander's Mole, which intercepted the sands carried by the tide and caused them to be deposited against the island. The small plan which we have taken from M. Renan's great work (Fig. 5) gives his idea as to the former position of the two harbours.[5]

Between the two, and along that part of the island which faced the continent, were the *neoria* (νεώρια), or berths for the galleys.[6] Stocks and building sheds were no doubt in a quarter by themselves, in a sort of dockyard communicating with the two commercial basins. Here, too, were the ferries for the traffic between the island and the mainland.

Let us suppose these harbours restored to their original condition ; they would be more like one of our small fishing harbours than such ports as Havre or Marseilles. Compared to ours the ships of the ancients were of very small size; they drew little water and took up very little space ; moreover, they were not always afloat ; they were laid up on land during the winter. Fishing boats were drawn up on the beach, while the great ships of war or commerce were dragged up over rollers into covered sheds, where they waited for the reopening of the season. And when the time came round they were not all rigged and launched

[1] These rocks are described by M. RENAN in his account of Tyre (*Mission*, pp 572, 573).

[2] On this subject see RENAN's plate lvii. and the accompanying text.

[3] APPIAN (*Anabasis*, ii. xx. 6, 9 ; xxi. 8 ; xxii. 3 ; xxiv. 1).

[4] Σιδών πόλις καὶ λιμὴν κλειστός. SCYLAX, *Peripius*, § 101.

[5] We must refer our readers to M. RENAN'S treatment of the question as to the site of the Tyrian harbours (*Mission*, pp. 559-571).

[6] This, at least, we gather from a comparison of APPIAN'S description (*Anabasis*, ii. 23) with that of DIODORUS (xvii. xlvi. 1).

at once. Each took its turn to glide into the water, receive its cargo, and be off. It was only when a number arrived together that there was any danger of overcrowding; and it must not be forgotten that during the summer those seas were, as a rule, so calm that ships could ride at anchor for two or three weeks at a time in such places as the roads of Beyrout or the south harbour of Sidon.

The Phœnician mariners found more favourable conditions outside their own country. Cyprus had no good natural harbours, but the anchorages on the coasts of Greece, Malta, Sicily, Sardinia, and Spain were many and excellent. In all those countries the only difficulty was to make a choice. The Tyrians were the first to discover the vast and well-sheltered roads of Cagliari and Cadiz.

On the other hand there were no natural harbours, no closed basins, in that part of Africa in which the Phœnicians chose to settle. But here their Syrian experience in the working of rock came in useful, and they soon succeeded in making up for the churlishness of nature. They excavated ample basins on the very beach, which they put in communication with the sea by narrow and easily defensible openings. This Virgil knew:—

Hic portus alii effodiunt,[1]

he says of the subjects of Dido in the passage where he describes the birth of the future enemy of Rome.

In the Phœnician language these artificial harbours were called *cothons* (κώθωνα); at least that is the Greek and Latin transliteration of the term.[2] The word has not yet been encountered in its native form, either in Hebrew or Phœnician; but the etymology proposed by the best Hebrew scholars confirms the definition given by lexicographers; "according to the latter *cothons* are harbours not made by nature, but by the hands of man."[3]

It is in speaking of Carthage that historians and grammarians find occasion to explain this Punic term, but most of the Phœnician

[1] *Æneid*, i. 427.

[2] SERVIUS, ad *Æneidem*, i. 427.

[3] "Cothona sunt portus non naturales, sed manu et arte facti" (SERVIUS, l. l.). So too FESTUS, s. v. *Catones*, which is obviously an error of the copyist for *cotones*. Gesenius, and Brochart before him, derived this word from a root, *k t*, which in Semitic languages implied an idea of *cutting*, *carving* (GESENIUS, *Scripturæ linguæque Phœnicæ monumenta*, p. 422; BROCHART, *Geographia sacra*, p. 512).

cities in Africa provided themselves with harbours after the same fashion as Carthage—some of them even before her. An examination of the ground has brought traces of such works to light at Adrumetum, Thapsus, and Utica.[1]

But if not the oldest, the harbours of Carthage were by far the most famous of all. The following short but fairly precise account of them is due, no doubt, to Polybius:

"The harbours of Carthage," says Appian, "were so arranged that ships had to pass through one to reach the other; on the side towards the sea there was but one entrance, seventy feet wide, which was closed with iron chains. The outer harbour, intended for merchant-ships, was provided with numerous and varied means of making them fast. In the middle of the second harbour there was an island, around which, as well as round the harbour itself, were wide quays. These quays presented a series of slips in which 220 vessels could be accommodated. Above the slips were store-rooms for rigging and other equipment. In front of each slip rose two Ionic columns, which gave to the circumference of harbour and island the look of a portico. On the island a pavilion was built for the admiral, whence signals were given by trumpet, orders sent by messengers, and a general surveillance kept up. The island was near the entrance; its surface was raised considerably above the level of the water, so that the admiral had a wide view over the sea outside, while those who passed along the coast could not see into the harbours. Even the merchants in the outer port could not see into the military basin; a double wall separated them from it, and they had a gate of their own communicating with the town, into which they could pass without going through the inner harbour."[2]

There were, then, two harbours, an outer one communicating directly with the sea, and an inner basin which could only be reached through the first. The outer basin was the commercial, the inner one the naval, harbour. The military pride of the Carthaginians led them to decorate the latter with some richness; the expressions used by the historian permit us to guess that the portico of which he speaks was not a real portico but only had the

[1] BARTH, *Wanderungen durch die Küstenländer des Mittelmeers*, vol. i. p. 150; DAUX, *Recherches sur les emporia phéniciens*, pp. 169-171.

[2] APPIAN, viii. 96.

appearance of one,[1] so that we may conclude that the Ionic columns were engaged columns or pilasters.

Ever since the end of the seventh century of our era man has done nothing at Carthage to preserve the work of man, and yet the soil still bears unmistakeable signs of the great undertakings by which the African city was made fit for the place it had to fill; ships can no longer penetrate into the two basins, which are almost filled with mud, but their contours may still be followed, and even

FIG. 265.—Present condition of the Carthaginian harbours. From Davis.[2]

the site of the island on which the admiral's palace stood may be clearly recognized (Fig. 265). The quays, with their sheds and store-rooms still exist under the mud flats and sandy hillocks. When pits are dug to a depth of eight or ten feet the basements of all these structures are encountered, and, at a lower depth still, the clayey sandstone which formed the bottom of the double basin. But such excavations are very difficult and irksome, on account of

[1] Εἰς εἰκόνα στοᾶς τὴν ὄψιν.

[2] *Carthage and Her Remains*, p. 128.

the water and mud which flow into them. Trenches were opened and soundings made at various points by Beulé and Count Camillo Borgia, but the latter met his death through the miasmic vapours of the place, and the former had to be content with very partial explorations.[1] By these Beulé was led to believe that the inner basin was circular,[2] but the trace he proposed failed under examination; it was shown that no room could be found on it for the number of slips provided in the military harbour of Carthage;[3] moreover, the notion of a circular basin is implicitly contradicted by the terms in which Appian describes Scipio's attack on the two harbours: "At the beginning of spring Scipio wished to attack Byrsa and the harbour which was called Cothon. During the night Hasdrubal set fire *to the quadrangular part of the Cothon*,[4] believing that it would again be exposed to the assault of the Roman general. . . . but Lelius surprised the opposite part of the Cothon, *which was circular*, by escalade."[5]

From this text it would appear that the harbour was rectilinear on some sides and circular or elliptical on the others, and this interpretation of the historian's words is confirmed by the obvious fact that in a circular harbour surrounded by berths for laying up vessels, a great deal of space would be wasted, each berth would be wider at the end farthest from the quay than it need be (see Figs. 266 and 267). Profiting by his experience at Utica, Daux proposes a restoration which agrees much better with Appian's narrative; he thinks that the quays were curved at the northern and southern ends of the harbour and straight on the east and west. He arranges the slips along the two straight sides, so that their dividing walls are parallel, which greatly simplifies the whole arrangement. Beulé's thin-walled chambers he believes to have been cisterns. From observations made at Adrumetum and still more at Utica he is led to believe that between the sheds and the dock itself there

[1] Upon Borgia's excavations see Beulé, *Fouilles et découvertes*, vol. ii. p. 47.

[2] Beulé, *Fouilles à Carthage*. Les ports, pp. 89-118, and plate iv.

[3] See especially the very close reasoning of Jal in his article on *Carthage* in the *Dictionnaire de biographie et d'histoire*. Beulé failed to perceive that the walls, a foot thick, which he found under the water, could not have been those against which the Ionic columns mentioned by Appian were placed, because they were far too thin. Daux arrives at the same conclusion (*Recherches*, &c., pp. 181-189 and 300).

[4] Τὸ μέρος τοῦ Κοθώνος τὸ τετρὰγωνον.

[5] Ἔλαθε Λαίλιος ἐπὶ θάτερα τοῦ Κώθωνος ἐς τὸ περίφερες αὐτοῦ μέρος ἀνελθών. Appian, viii. 127.

were wide quays;[1] the galleys, he thinks, were hauled up high and dry after being relieved of their ballast and rigging.

Beulé flattered himself he had found some remains of the Ionic colonnade which surrounded the harbour.[2] But our present business is less with a superficial and foreign-born ornament like this than



FIG. 266.—The harbours of Carthage according to Beulé.

with the arrangement of the harbour as a whole, an arrangement whose leading lines are given by the text of Appian, by the present aspect of the ground, and by the scanty fragments of the ancient structures brought to light by excavation; these excavations, however, have only been partial and are now again filled up, so that it is impossible to test the accuracy of conclusions which were arrived



FIG. 267.—Arrangement of the berths according to Beulé.

at very quickly. Many details are still obscure. Were the chambers beneath the water-level really cisterns, as Daux will have

[1] DAUX, *Recherches*, p. 182.

[2] *Fouilles à Carthage*, pp. 109, 110, pl. v., figs. 8 and 9. Beulé seems to have been mistaken in placing a pair of coupled columns between each berth and the next; there could hardly have been more than one, for otherwise walls at their back would have been so thick as to complicate the work unnecessarily and to waste much space. Three columns were enough for two berths. So that we arrive at a grand total, not of 440 columns, as Beulé says (p. 110), but of 224. JAL, *Dictionnaire*, p. 327.

it? How are we to reconcile the feeble diameter of the fluted Ionic drums found by Beulé with the scale of such architectural decorations as would have been required to give any effect round



FIG. 268.—The harbours of Carthage according to Daux.

a basin larger, according to the explorer's own figures, than the Place de la Concorde, at Paris?[1]

[1] The diameter of the fragment whose plan is given by Beulé (pl. v. fig. 9) is eighteen and three-quarters inches. Now if we take the greatest height which could possibly go with such a diameter we arrive at columns between fourteen feet four inches and fourteen feet ten inches high, at most. The columns of Gabriel's two palaces on the north side of the Place de la Concorde are thirty-two feet ten inches high, while, according to the figures given by Beulé, the naval dock at Carthage was about one-eighteenth larger in total area than the Parisian *place* (JAL, *Dictionnaire*, p. 327). It will be seen therefore that Beulé's fragment can only have belonged to small columns better fitted for the decoration of an attic or a balcony than to fill an independent place beside such a vast basin.

The whole question still remains to be decided. Criticism has demolished nearly all that Beulé thought he had established. The most probable part of his restoration is the circular island which occupies the centre of the inner basin ; it must have been about two and a quarter acres in extent. When the harbour was excavated this island was left standing, and wherever the clayey sandstone of the site was wanting the deficiency was made up by regular courses of large tufa blocks. The area thus obtained was inclosed by a quay supported by two concentric walls of equal height. The width of the quay was thirty-one feet including the walls ; on the north a causeway thirty-two feet wide connected the island with the land ; . . . . . this causeway was bisected at about half its length by a transverse opening fifteen feet wide through which small boats could pass. There must have been a bridge over the opening, like the canal bridges at Venice. As for



FIG. 269.—Cornice moulding. From Beulé.

the war-galleys, there was plenty of room for them on each side of the causeway, which was at the farther end of the dock, opposite to the entrance from the commercial harbour."[1]

Beulé also discovered a few remains of the Carthaginian admiral's palace. Large and carefully dressed stones seem to have been used upon it. On several blocks which have been recognized as parts of a cornice a coat of stucco, painted red and yellow, may still be clearly traced. We give the profile of a moulding on several of these blocks (Fig. 269). It recalls the section used by the Greeks with their Doric order ; some more mouldings of the same class are heavy and halting in execution. The building itself must date from the Punic period ; like the colonnade about the basin it seems to have been decorated in pure Greek style but without much care or taste. No shafts or capitals have been found.

[1] BEULÉ, *Fouilles à Carthage*, p. 100.

Perhaps there was no portico; the walls may have been decorated only with string courses and cornices. There were two stories, because two distinct mouldings have been found, the one a string course, eighteen inches deep (Fig. 269), the other a cornice with a depth of thirty inches.[1]

These fragments from the northern part of the island are distinguished from others found a little farther south by difference of material as well as simplicity of workmanship. At the latter point several drums of Numidian breccia and many fragments of marble cornices, decorated with oves, lentils, acanthus and other leaves, have been found. The old Carthaginian lodge was destroyed no doubt when the place was captured by Scipio, and a Roman palace in all the wealth of imperial luxury was raised in its stead when the city was re-founded.

In the commercial port the combination of curved with straight lines which we had to divine in the case of the naval harbour has been actually traced. According to Beulé's measurements the channel between the two basins was about eighty feet wide, which hardly differs from the width ascribed by Appian to the passage between the commercial harbour and the sea. This passage must have been altered in the Roman period, for we cannot recognize the opening described by Appian in the narrow gate, only nineteen feet six inches wide, which was discovered and measured by Beulé. That explorer seeks to explain the change by the necessity under which the Carthaginians found themselves to provide against the silting up of their harbour by the sand brought down with the waters of the Bagrada. We need not go into this question here, however; it will be decided by some future excavator, who ought to find the ancient gates which, according to Appian, were closed with a pair of chains.

Beulé calculates that the combined area of the Carthaginian harbours was twenty-three hectares sixteen ares (about fifty-eight acres).[2] The old harbour at Marseilles covers twenty-seven hectares (about sixty-five acres) and is supposed to hold about 1,100 merchant-ships. Taking the average tonnage of the ships frequenting the port of Carthage to be about the same as that of the vessels entering the harbour which was sufficient for the

[1] BEULÉ, *Fouilles à Carthage*, pp. 103, 104.

[2] If we adopt the trace proposed by Daux for the naval harbour we shall have to modify these figures considerably.

traffic of the great French port for so many centuries, we may conclude that the two basins could find accommodation for about 937 vessels. But the ships of the ancients were much smaller than ours, and many of those entering the Carthaginian *Cothon* were nothing more than decked boats, so that we may take a much higher figure than 937 as representing the real capacity of the port. We only make these comparisons to help our readers to a true idea of what the harbours in which the war and merchant fleets of Carthage found shelter really were. The word *cothon* was used, we think, of the two great harbours taken together. But those closed basins cannot have sufficed for the whole maritime trade of Carthage; many vessels must have found moorings in the Lake of Tunis, which was then much deeper than it is now; others would lie on the beach below the southern wall, in the neighbourhood of the bazaar and the populous quarter which stretched away to the west of the two great harbours. During the fine season some would unload their cargoes on the quays which lay along the sea to the east of the quarter commanded by Byrsa.[1] Farther to the north, between the two capes now called *Sidi-bou-Saïd* and *Kamart* there was a fair anchorage opposite to a sandy beach; the name of *La Marsa* or "the harbour," which still clings to the village in the neighbourhood of this little bay, shows that vessels might there still be loaded and discharged.[2] Finally, on the north-west, at one extremity of the great suburb of Megalia, on the same side as the lake now known as the *Sebkha of Soukhara* or *El-Rouan*, the sea washed the very foot of the ramparts; here must have been the harbour for the small vessels trading with Utica and the neighbouring coast,[3] so that

[1] Traces of these quays have been found by every explorer.

[2] This is now the watering-place of the district, the favourite spot being near the villa called *Palais-Khasnadar*. The appearance of the ground here seems to show that the sea has retreated; in antiquity the bay must have been much deeper and may have offered a very good anchorage.

[3] M. Tissot told me that he found traces of an anchorage on this side. We know from a passage in Appian that the *Sebkha* was once a wide bay with a sufficient depth of water. The new consul, Emilius Scipio, entered the harbour of Utica with reinforcements in the evening, and during the same night sailed with his squadron to go to the help of Mancinus; he arrived next morning, just at the very moment that his predecessor was about to succumb, and the Carthaginians beat a retreat as soon as they caught sight of his ships (APPIAN, viii. 104). If he had had to double Cape Carthage a whole day would not have been enough for the transit, so that we may conclude that it was by the bay now represented by the *Sebkha* that he was so

in time of peace the merchandise carried from place to place along the length of those fertile shores could find its way into the great maritime city through many inlets.

Utica was the oldest of the Phœnician settlements in this part of Africa. It was built at the head of a well-sheltered bay, and rather nearer Sicily than Carthage. The Bagrada, which once fell into the sea between the two cities, ended by changing its course and depositing its mud and sand in the bay of Utica, which it in time filled up.[1] The remains of the ancient city are now little short of six miles from the sea (Fig. 270).[2]

The site of Utica, as marked by the remains of several important buildings, corresponds very well with what we are told by classic writers.[3] There is an elongated hill whose north-western extremity, formerly washed by the waves, is now surrounded by reedy marshes. Further on in the same direction and just above the swamp there is a platform of some height, separated from the chief mass of the hill by an artificial channel in the rock about 132 feet wide and 1,000 yards long. This platform represents the seaward end of the promontory. It is an artificial island, rendered so by the cutting of the channel just mentioned, and must have been the original Utica, the seat of those primitive Phœnician colonists who thought thus to protect themselves against any sudden attack by the Libyan tribes about them. And this channel formed an excellent dock as well as a defence; it was the commercial harbour as long as the town lasted. In the same island there is a second artificial harbour; it is rectangular in shape, and measures about 330 feet by 110 (7 on Fig. 270). This is supposed to have been the earliest of the harbours of Utica.

rapidly carried to the seat of action, which may have been somewhere to the west of Megalia.

[1] On the course of this river and the successive displacements of its mouth see CH. TISSOT, *Le Bassin du Bagrada et la voie romaine de Carthage à Hippone par Bulla Regia* (4to, 1884, in the *Mémoires présentés par divers savants à l'Académie des Inscriptions*).

[2] The topographical sketch which we borrow from M. TISSOT (*Le Bassin du Bagrada*, pl. vi.) is nothing but plate ix. of the work of Daux (*Vue d' Utique restaurée telle qu'elle était en l'an 46 avant notre ère*) transcribed into a plan. All the details are due to the researches of Daux. Several of the buildings indicated, such as the theatre, the amphitheatre, the circus, date only from the Roman occupation.

[3] STRABO, xvii. iii. 13; LIVY, xxix. 35; CÆSAR, *De Bello Civili*, ii. 37; APPIAN, viii. 75. The last-named tells us that Utica had several harbours all easy of access.



FIG. 270.—Utica in the time of Cæsar.

In time the town outgrew the island, and built for itself a rampart round the hill and the slopes which joined it with the sea on the east and north. A citadel was built on the highest summit, while temples, houses, and other buildings were grouped between the fortress and the sea-shore, whose ancient line may still be easily followed. A new cothon was excavated on the north-western face of the rampart, and served as the military port of that Utica



FIG. 271.—Plan of the naval harbour at Utica. From Daux.

which resigned itself with so ill a grace to the supremacy of Carthage, and was always ready to make common cause with her enemies, whether they called themselves Scipio, Regulus, or Agathocles.

This harbour was a rectangle of about 792 feet by 415; the corners were rounded. The two short sides and the long side away from the sea were lined with quays, behind which ran a two storied building, the lower story standing out a little beyond the

upper (Fig. 271).[1] It has been suggested that the upper story contained store rooms while the lower consisted of slips like those at Carthage, in which galleys were laid up. The chambers of the lower story were twenty-three feet eight inches high, sixty feet deep, and fifteen feet four inches wide. Can these really have been sheds for galleys? More than one objection occurs to us. We may,



FIG. 272.—Admiral's palace, Utica. Plan of the ground-floor. From Daux.

perhaps, accept their width as sufficient but we cannot say as much for their length. The Attic trireme, of which we know more than of any other ship used by the ancients, was from 112 to 116 feet long.[2] And how were the galleys to be lifted to the level of the

[1] Our woodcut only shows one half of the basin, but as the whole was symmetrically arranged the other half may be guessed from it.

[2] CARTAULT, *La Trière athénienne*, pp. 245, 246.

quays? Ought we not to wait until something in the nature of an inclined plane is discovered before we conclude that these chambers were stalls for war galleys? The question deserves closer study than it has yet received.

Even before Daux had made his researches visitors to the site of Utica were struck by the fact that the arrangement of its naval harbour was quite similar to that described by Appian for Carthage.[1] As in the cothon of the latter city, an islet was left in the centre of the basin; its area was about two acres; a kind of isthmus joined it to the principal quay and nearly the whole of its surface was covered by a building whose huge ruins, still partly standing, have such a peculiar character of their own.

Daux is the only explorer who has made a stay of any length in this barren and malarious region; he put forward a curious restoration of the building in question, which we cannot pretend to dispute; but death prevented him from setting out his proofs and giving us those details of his explorations upon which he based his idea. It is, therefore, under all reserve that we reproduce a plan (Fig. 272) and two elevations (Figs. 273 and 274) compiled by him.

"The admiral's palace consisted of a main block flanked by six round towers, and of four bastions or lateral ports. The main block was a huge irregular parallelogram with a round tower at each of its external angles. In the centre was a rectangular court (D) from which the chief apartments were lighted. All round this court ran a two-storied vaulted loggia supported on piers. In the centre of the north side of the palace a great door surmounted by a large balcony and flanked by two engaged towers, like those at the external angles, opened upon a small basin (A) divided by quays from the main harbour, with which, however, it communicated by a narrow opening; here waited the fleet of boats by which the admiral's orders were transmitted, and the barge in which he himself made his rounds or went off to his 'flag-ship.'

"On the opposite or southern side was a forecourt (E) with a fortified gateway and flanking towers like those on the main block. Outside this gateway there was a wide jetty communicating with the causeway by which the islet was connected with the mainland.

[1] DAVIS, *Carthage and Her Remains*, pp. 506-508; V. GUÉRIN, *Voyage dans la Régence*, vol. i. p. 9; BEULÉ, *Fouilles à Carthage*, p. 114.

On the east and west the whole building was flanked by two strong bastions (c), their angles rounded like those of the harbour itself. These bastions were composed of a strong curtain with three faces, supported within on piers and arches. They had courtyards inside them. This curtain was crenellated and on its platform there was room to work military engines. On the north side the whole building was still further strengthened by two square forts. Between the foot of the external wall and the water there was a continuous quay, within which a series of small parallel cisterns was contrived."[1]

Daux is not content to re-establish the plan of the ground-floor from the remains still in place, from the stretches of wall, and even fragments of vaults which are yet standing; he has attempted to restore the arrangements of the upper floors, and to that end has made use of the broken masonry lying about the site. We are unable either to dispute or to appreciate the value of his work; we have no means of knowing how much of it is pure conjecture and how much founded on evidence.

We must, therefore, decline to follow him into the details of his restoration, and be content with pointing out certain features which are attested both by his formal statements and by some of the drawings in his plates.

Being entirely of concrete, this palace had a look of weight and solidity not unlike that of Chaldæan and Assyrian buildings. The rooms were only lighted by windows four feet eight inches high and two feet two inches wide, so that they must have been dark enough, especially as the walls were nearly four feet thick at their thinnest part.

Some of the halls distributed about the central court were rectangular, others round; the four round ones were in the angles and were covered by hemi-spherical domes. The other rooms, which were longer and wider, had spherical vaults. In each of the four angle towers of the main building, as well as in the pair flanking the great doorway, there was a rectangular spiral staircase with landings and thirty inches wide. It led up to the flat roofs. The rooms on the first story were reached by a different set of staircases contrived in the thickness of the walls.

No trace of a stone or even of a stucco casing has been found.

[1] DAUX, *Recherches*, pp. 201, 202.



FIG. 273.—Restoration of the northern façade of the admiral's palace, Utica.

FIG. 274.—Restoration of a lateral façade.

There were few mouldings, and those of the most elementary kind. On the outside a huge torus ran round the walls and towers at about a third of their height from the ground; in the interior a roughly profiled *cyma reversa* marked the foot of the walls and was repeated about ten feet from the ground.

These were the only ornaments to break the nudity of the great concrete surfaces. The general look of the building must have been very severe. It was, in fact, a fortress rather than a palace. The governing idea of its builder was to obtain solidity at any cost, and to make use of every defensive contrivance known to his time. The external walls were very thick and strong, especially near their base, where a battering-ram installed on a raft might otherwise have effected a breach. Their great height made an escalade difficult; their platforms were fifty-one feet six inches above the water, and these measurements were increased by the height of the battlements. Any assailant would find himself exposed at every point to the fire of the defenders; the angle towers flank the whole of the walls while the narrow strip of quay at their base would hardly afford room to plant a scaling ladder with a slope sufficient to prevent the garrison from easily throwing it off.

Well arranged for defence, this palace or castle was also thoroughly well adapted for the surveillance of the port. From its terraced roofs the officer in charge had a full view of the basin and its dependencies and of the sea beyond. Over the chief entrance there was a wide balcony, sheltered by an arch, from which the admiral could superintend the arrival and setting out of fleets.

Was this strange building Phœnician? All the probabilities answer yes.

No doubt the absence of any well-attested Phœnician building in which barrel vaults and domes play the important part they do here makes us hesitate for a moment, but, on the other hand, would our difficulties be lessened if we attempted to claim the building for the Romans? When could the Romans have built such a castle? Could they have done so during the period, between the fall of Carthage and its restoration, when Utica was the residence of the pro-consul and the capital of the province? But at that time the Mediterranean was a Roman lake. Its ports

had no attack to fear, and it is difficult to see why the new masters of Utica should have undertaken such a work. Moreover, the Romans seem to have been ignorant down to our era of all arches but those of carefully-dressed masonry; the earliest cupolas of brick or concrete in Rome date from the end of the first century.[1]

Does the work date from the first 200 years of the empire? At that time the peace of Rome was more profound and her power more solidly established upon the African coast than ever. Moreover, as soon as the seat of government was transported to the new Carthage, Utica seems to have decayed fast; stripped of her political importance life gradually receded from her, and her harbours were left to be smothered in the sands of the Bagrada. We can hardly believe that she would then set to work at such a building as this.

The method of construction is quite different from that used in the numerous Roman buildings in the African province; the latter resemble the castle at Utica neither in decoration nor in the details of their masonry.

Finally, can a single instance be named of the Romans leaving an island in the centre of an artificial harbour as a site for an admiral's palace?

We know, however, that such an arrangement existed at Carthage, and it is natural to suppose that she, the *New Town*, borrowed the idea from her elder sister. Utica had already enjoyed centuries of life and prosperity when the development of Carthage began. The Phœnicians understood the principle of the vault. In spite of their love for huge units they had now and then made use of concrete in various forms. In Syria, Spain, and Africa itself, they had raised concrete breakwaters and land defences of pisé, or beaten earth; their tombs, even, were sometimes of such materials; so that we are justified in supposing that the Phœnicians of Africa had a regular system of architecture founded upon them.

We are, then, inclined to see in the ruins described by Daux the remains of a Phœnician building of no slight antiquity. Certain parts of it appear to have been rearranged in the Roman period; the terraces were repaired; a few arches were rebuilt in voussoirs

[1] CHOISY, *L'art de bâtir chez les Romains*, pp. 32-33.

of dressed stone ; but these partial retouches in no way changed the general character of the work ; their only object was to preserve it from destruction. During the long years of peace under the Roman power the old Phœnician stronghold must have been in much the same position as more than one of our mediæval castles are now ; it had nothing to do in a port which no enemy threatened, and if kept up at all it was kept up as a storehouse or prison.

The particulars we have been able to collect as to the *Cothons* of Carthage and Utica are enough to show how much labour and thought the Phœnicians gave to their forts, and how much skill their architects displayed in making the best use of the space at their command. They soon awoke to the need of separating the commercial from the naval harbour ; the former had to be always open, so that the merchant captains could profit by a favourable wind at any moment of the day or night. The case of the naval harbour was quite different. There all had to give way before the necessity for defence ; the governing idea was to put the war-fleet beyond the reach of attack or even of prying eyes. Open enemies were not the only ones to be feared ; there were also sharp-eyed spies to be kept out, men who could tell at a glance how many ships were on the stocks and how many ready to take the sea, and foreign workmen—smiths, carpenters, caulkers—had also to be prevented from learning the trade secrets of the dockyard.

In all matters of industry, of commerce, and navigation the Phœnicians pretended to a monopoly, and they guarded the secrets of their methods and operations with the most pitiless jealousy. Nothing could be more in character with their whole course of proceeding than the arrangement of such harbours as those of Utica and Carthage. They cut their basins inland not only for reasons connected with the shape of the coast, but also that they might keep them, as it were, under lock and key, might surround them with a double rampart, first with that of the city as a whole, and secondly with that inner wall by which the harbours were turned into a kind of town within a town, the admiral's palace being the citadel. This inner town had its water-gates and its land-gates, through which neither boat nor pedestrian could pass without permission. Venice, the modern Carthage, took

precautions of exactly the same kind against unbidden visitors to her famous arsenal.

The Phœnicians were at no less pains to form anchorages for their fleets than to secure them against unfriendly neighbours. At Ruad, at Saïda, and at Sour the remains of ancient breakwaters may be seen, and the way in which gaps in the natural reefs were filled up with masonry may still be traced.[1] But the finest ruins of the kind are off the coast of Africa. Thus in the Utica marshes some parts of the fine mole which separated the naval harbour from the sea are still visible. Adrumetum (Sousa) and Thapsus (Dimas) possess even more considerable remains of the same kind.[2] The mole of Thapsus is still 860 feet long (Fig. 275). Its actual width, after all the waves have carried away in an

FIG. 275.—The mole of Thapsus. Elevation. From Daux.

attack spread over five or six-and-twenty centuries, is nearly thirty-six feet. It must once have been at least forty feet wide if each flank had a face of masonry. The part that is left is of very dense rubble and is built upon piles. The work was intended to protect the entrance to the naval harbour, which was situated between the fortifications of the town of Thapsus and those of its acropolis. As at Utica the trade harbour was an arm of the sea running between the mainland and a small island.

There is a curious arrangement in this mole which bears witness to the skill of its constructor. The actual height of the mass above the water is eight feet. Upon both faces, and above

[1] RENAN, *Mission*, pp. 40 and 362; plates lxxii. and lxxiii.
[2] DAUX, *Recherches*, pp. 169-171.

the reach of the sea when calm, there are a number of rectangular cavities. These are arranged in rows, chess-board fashion, at horizontal distances of four feet ten inches, with a vertical distance of three feet eight inches between the rows. These holes are ten inches high by seven wide at their mouths ; they go through the whole thickness of the mole at right angles to its major axis. A longitudinal canal of the same calibre runs down the centre of the mass, and connects the transverse channels in each row (Fig 276). By this contrivance the power of the waves would be sensibly diminished, as they would lose part of their force in the pipes, which had a gentle slope to allow the water to flow out again freely. The upper row of channels is now almost at the surface of the mole, a clear proof that the latter was once much higher than it is now. The total height above the sea was probably from sixteen to eighteen feet.



FIG. 276.—Plan of the mole of Thapsus.

I do not think we have dwelt too long upon the remains of Phœnician harbours and dockyards. It was upon such structures that the chief efforts of the people, both in Syria and Africa, were directed, and their development affords the best illustration of the part played by these great traders in the ancient world. Hence we believe that too much stress can hardly be laid upon the necessity for excavating the two great Carthaginian harbours. If this undertaking be put off much longer it will become impossible. Thirty years ago the site was almost a desert ; ground could be broken almost anywhere at the cost of compensating some peasant farmer for a few uprooted vines or olives. But since the opening of the railway from Goletta country houses have never ceased to multiply on the peninsula ; they have changed the face of the country and are making excavations more difficult every year. Carthage is not likely to revive altogether ; such a port as modern ships require could hardly be formed there ; to Biserta, the ancient Hippo-Diarrytos, with its fine lake of deep

water, must we look for the heir both of Tunis and Carthage. But the site of Carthage is far healthier than that of Tunis, and it will soon become a suburb of the capital and a favourite retreat for its citizens during the heat of summer. Explorers then should gird up their loins; the work before them could hardly fail to give important results if systematically undertaken, but every season adds to its difficulty.

END OF VOL. I.

LONDON: R. CLAY, SONS, AND TAYLOR, PRINTERS.

HISTORY OF ANCIENT EGYPTIAN ART.

By GEORGES PERROT and CHARLES CHIPIEZ.

Translated from the French by W. Armstrong. Containing 616 Engravings. In 2 vols. imperial 8vo. 42s.

"The study of Egyptology is one which grows from day to day, and which has now reached such proportions as to demand arrangement and selection almost more than increased collection of material. The well-known volumes of MM. Perrot and Chipiez supply this requirement to an extent which had never hitherto been attempted, and which, before the latest researches of Mariette and Maspero, would have been impossible. Without waiting for the illustrious authors to complete their great undertaking, Mr. W. Armstrong has very properly seized their first instalment, and has presented to the English public all that has yet appeared of a most useful and fascinating work. To translate such a book, however, is a task that needs the revision of a specialist, and this Mr. Armstrong has felt, for he has not sent out his version to the world without the sanction of Dr. Birch and Mr. Reginald Stuart Poole. The result is in every way satisfactory to his readers, whose attention is further stimulated and their knowledge advanced by more than 600 illustrations. Mr. Armstrong adds, in an appendix, a description of that startling discovery which occurred just after the French original of these volumes left the press—namely, the finding of thirty-eight royal mummies, with their sepulchral furniture, in a subterranean chamber at Thebes. This event, which was one of the most romantic in the annals of archæology, is still fresh in our memories, but it forms an exceedingly interesting commentary on M. Perrot's praise of inductive processes in the practice of antiquarian research. It forms a brilliant ending to a work of great value and beauty."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

"A week's study of these volumes would better prepare a traveller for appreciating the wonders of Egypt than a year's turning over of the 'Denkmäler' of Lepsius, the 'Monumenti' of Rosellini, or the 'Monuments' of Champollion. . . . . Mr. Armstrong's translation is a necessary and useful work. It is well written, and with unusual care—some new information having been added. Such a book should, far more than the drawing-room volume of Ebers, attract new students to the constantly decreasing body of Egyptologists in this country; for it is full of the charm of Egypt, leading the reader back to the ideas which took shapes we may almost call immortal, whether we regard their first embodiment or their long survival in ever-changing forms."—*St. James's Gazette.*

The Saturday Review, speaking of the French Edition, says: "To say that this magnificent work is the best history of Egyptian Art that we possess, is to state one of the least of its titles to the admiration of all lovers of antiquity, Egyptian or other. *No previous work can be compared with it for method or completeness. . . . . Not only are the best engravings from the older authorities* utilised, but numerous unpublished designs have been inserted. *This history of Egyptian Art is an invaluable treasure-house for the student; and we may add, there are few more delightful volumes for the cultivated idle who live at ease to turn over—EVERY PAGE IS FULL OF ARTISTIC INTEREST.*'

"Messrs. Chapman and Hall deserve the best thanks of the public for their translated version of this really invaluable work. Being issued in two volumes, their edition is much handier than the French original, which contains over 950 pages, and is as unmanageable as a Family Bible. Their type is also larger, their paper of a better quality, and the general aspect of their page more attractive. Of Mr. Walter Armstrong's translation it is pleasant to be able to report as favourably as of the form in which it is published. That it is a paraphrastic translation will probably be a recommendation to most readers; and if, like most paraphrases, it fails to convey with precision every delicate shade of the Author's meaning, it is at all events, bettered by that air of spontaneity which lends so much charm to paraphrase of the best kind. Mr. Armstrong lacks the elegant and definite style of M. Perrot; but he says what he has to say in fewer, and sometimes in more forcible words. His English is, however, occasionally not a little careless, whereas M. Perrot's French is not only graceful, flexible, and transparent, but exquisitely correct. Yet that he should, however, render these qualities of style into equivalent English is more than we have, perhaps, the right to expect from any translator. Mr. Armstrong, has, at all events, with reasonable fidelity, reproduced the sense of his author, and he has reproduced it with an agreeable freedom in which few of his readers will probably detect any traces of the process of translation."—*The Academy.*

"The plan of M. Perrot's work, as set forth in his elaborate preface, is as well considered as it is comprehensive. . . . . M. Perrot brings to his vast enterprise thorough and many-sided scholarship, together with that enthusiasm for his work which is as indispensable to the true scholar as to the poet. In M. C. Chipiez he has found an able collaborator, more especially in the portions of his work relating to architecture. For the first volume some of the leading artists and savants of France, including Gerôme, Hector, Lerouse, and Maspero, have placed their sketch-books and their special investigations at the author's disposal."—*Extracted from article on the French edition in the Times.*

"The reasoning is clear and apparently correct, and the style of the translation leaves nothing to be desired. The book is particularly welcome at present, when we are so much concerned with the affairs of Egypt."—*Daily News.*

A HISTORY OF ART

IN

CHALDÆA AND ASSYRIA.

BY

GEORGES PERROT AND CHARLES CHIPIEZ.

Translated by WALTER ARMSTRONG, *B.A. Oxon.* *2 Vols. royal 8vo, with 452 Illustrations.* *42s.*

"It is profusely illustrated, not merely with representations of the actual remains preserved in the British Museum, the Louvre, and elsewhere, but also with ingenious conjectural representations of the principal buildings from which those remains have been taken. To Englishmen familiar with the magnificent collection of Assyrian antiquities preserved in the British Museum the volume should be especially welcome. It is not given to every observer to perform the effort of constructive imagination necessary to invest with their full significance the scattered remains and fragments preserved in a museum; but an intelligent study of the work of MM. Perrot and Chipiez will greatly facilitate the effort, and render it doubly instructive. We may further mention that an English translation by Mr. Walter Armstrong, with the numerous illustrations of the original, has just been published by Messrs. Chapman and Hall."—*Times.*

"The only dissatisfaction that we can feel in turning over the two beautiful volumes in illustration of Chaldæan and Assyrian Art, by MM. Perrot and Chipiez, is in the reflection, that in this, as in so many other publications of a similar scope and nature, it is a foreign name that we see on the title page, and a translation only which we can lay to our own national credit. That we borrow our plays 'from the French,' has become a stereotyped reproach against us, the weight of which, however, is in one sense lessened by the fact that a good deal of this kind of plunder has not been worth appropriation, and might better have been left to bloom unseen, or unborrowed, in its native atmosphere. But in the case of works on such subjects as the history and critical appreciation of ancient art, we can seldom lay such flattering unction to our souls. The predominance of really important works on Archæology which have to be translated for the larger reading public of England, and the comparative scarcity of original English works of a similar calibre, is a reproach to us which we would fain see removed. . . . It is most frequently to French and German writers that we are indebted for the best light and the most interesting criticisms on the arts of antiquity. Mr. Armstrong's translation is very well done."—*Builder.*

"Of these volumes it is impossible to speak too highly. Well got up and sumptuously illustrated, they are at once invaluable to the student and of engrossing interest to the general reader. Reproducing many of the treasures in the British Museum, they possess a national interest which fully justifies their translation; and Mr. Armstrong deserves some acknowledgment for the thorough and workmanlike method in which he has performed his task. The present volumes are worthy successors to the first two volumes of MM. Perrot and Chipiez's 'History of Ancient Art.'"—*Globe.*

"The two handsome volumes which MM. Perrot and Chipiez published last year have been succeeded by two more. In the present volumes, though some of the drawings are too sketchy to do justice to the subjects, the cuts are very superior; and, as in the former work, the architectural views and restorations are admirable. The most important and illustrative objects are in the British Museum, and any reader can judge of the accuracy of the representations in MM. Perrot and Chipiez's book. The historical sketch is extremely clear. There is no literary feat which a French author performs better than that of abridging history. A German makes his summary stiff with dry facts. An Englishman takes opinions without facts. But a Frenchman can step lightly over the highest points, neglecting or ignoring what is not necessary to the narrative, and leaving on the reader's mind a clear, if often mistaken and inaccurate, impression, flattering him with the idea that he is now fully acquainted with the whole subject, and has nothing more to learn. This sort of thing is pleasant reading; and in the case before us we have to say a word of commendation for Mr. Armstrong's translation. It is impossible to make any kind of summary of the contents of these two lavishly-illustrated volumes. They are compressed already to the utmost; and without the pictures, of which there are so many, no mere description would convey the distinct and vivid impression left upon the mind by a study of the work."—*Saturday Review.*

"The work is a valuable addition to archæological literature, and the thanks of the whole civilised world are due to the authors who have so carefully compiled the history of the arts of two peoples, often forgotten, but who were in reality the founders of Western civilisation."—*Graphic.*

114968

Date Due

Library Bureau Cat. No. 1137

N
5410
P46lhEa 114968
v.1
AUTHOR
Perrot, G.
TITLE History of art in Phoenicia and its dependencies.

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED
FEB 18 '58	LETTERING	
	Next: G.E.Wright.	
FEB 25 '58	REQUEST SHELF	